THIS BOOK
MUST NOT BE REMOVED
FROM THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON LIBRARY

REFERENCE ONLY

PARL. PAPERS
OR REFERENCE ONLY.

616939

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_april-24-may-6-1907_173

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION),

FOURTH SERIES

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT
OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

7 EDWARD VII.

VOLUME CLXXIII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM WEDNESDAY, TWENTY-FOURTH DAY OF APRIL, 1907, TO MONDAY, SIXTH DAY OF MAY, 1907.

FIFTH VOLUME OF SESSION

1907.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED,
UNDER CONTRACT WITH HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE,
BY
WYMAN AND SONS, LIMITED, FETTER LANE, LONDON.

8472

CHRONOLOGY OF "THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES."

THE PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY contains all that can be collected of the Legislative History of this country from the Conquest to the close of the XVIIIth Century (1803), 36 vols. The chief sources whence these Debates are derived are the Constitutional History, 24 vols.; Sir Simonds D'Ewes' Journal; Debates of the Commons in 1620 and 1621; Chandler and Timberland's Debates, 22 vols.; Grey's Debates of the Commons, from 1667 to 1694, 10 vols.; Almon's Debates, 24 vols.; Debrett's Debates, 63 vols.; The Hardwicke Papers; Debates in Parliament by Dr. Johnson, &c., &c.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES commence with the year 1803, and the contents are set forth in the following Chronological Table:—

HISTORY.

CONQUEST to 34 GEO. II.—1066 to 1760.

Vol. 1 to 15, 1 WILL. I. to 34 GEO. II.
1066-1760

REIGN OF GEORGE III.—1760 to 1820.

Vol. 15 to 35, 1 GEO. III. to 40 GEO. III.
1760-1800

(FIRST PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 35	41 GEO. III.	1801
— 36	42 —	1802

(SECOND PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 36	42 GEO. III.	1802-3

DEBATES.

First Series.

(SECOND PARLIAMENT—*continued.*)

Vol. 1 & 2	44 GEO. III.	1803-4
— 3 to 5	45 —	1805
— 6 & 7	46 —	1806

(THIRD PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 8 & 9	47 GEO. III.	1806-7

(FOURTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 9 to 11	48 GEO. III.	1807-8
— 12 — 14	49 —	1809
— 15 — 17	50 —	1810
— 18 — 20	51 —	1810-11
— 21 — 23	52 —	1812

(FIFTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 24 to 26	53 GEO. III.	1812-13
— 27 & 28	54 —	1813-14
— 29 to 31	55 —	1814-15
— 32 — 34	56 —	1816
— 35 & 36	57 —	1817
— 37 — 38	58 —	1818

(SIXTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 39 & 40	59 GEO. III.	1819
— 41	60 —	1819-20

Second Series.

REIGN OF GEORGE IV.—1820 to 1830.

(SEVENTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 1 to 3	1 GEO. IV.	1820
— 4 & 5	2 —	1821
— 6 — 7	3 —	1822
— 8 — 9	4 —	1823
— 10 — 11	5 —	1824
— 12 — 13	6 —	1825-6
— 14 — 15	7 —	1826

(EIGHTH PARLIAMENT.)

Vol. 16	7 GEO. IV.	1826
— 17	8 —	1827
— 18 & 19	9 —	1828
— 20 — 21	10 —	1829
— 22 to 25	11 —	1830

Third Series.

REIGN OF WILLIAM IV.—1830 to 1837.

(Ninth Parliament.)

Vol.	1 to 3	1	Will. IV.	1830-1

(Tenth Parliament.)

Vol.	4 to 8	2	Will. IV.	1832
—	9 — 14	3	—	1831

(Eleventh Parliament.)

Vol.	15 to 20	4	Will. IV.	1833
—	21 — 25	5	—	1834

(Twelfth Parliament.)

Vol.	26 to 30	6	Will. IV.	1835
—	31 — 35	7	—	1836
—	36 — 38	8	—	1837

REIGN OF VICTORIA—1837 to 1901.

(Thirteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	39 to 44	1	Victoria	1838
—	45 — 50	2	—	1839
—	51 — 55	3	—	1840
—	56 — 58	4	—	(a) 1841

(Fourteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	59	4	Victoria	(b) 1841
—	60 to 65	5	—	1842
—	66 — 71	6	—	1843
—	72 — 76	7	—	1844
—	77 — 82	8	—	1845
—	83 — 88	9	—	1846
—	89 — 94	10	—	(a) 1847

(Fifteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	95	10	Victoria	(b) 1847
—	96 to 101	11	—	1848
—	102 — 107	12	—	1849
—	108 — 113	13	—	1850
—	114 — 118	14	—	1851
—	119 — 122	15	—	(a) 1852

(Sixteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	123	15	Victoria	(b) 1852
—	124 to 129	16	—	1853
—	130 — 135	17	—	1854
—	136 — 139	18	—	1855
—	140 — 143	19	—	1856
—	144	20	—	(a) 1857

(Seventeenth Parliament.)

Vol.	145 to 147	20	Victoria	(b) 1857
—	148 — 151	21	—	1858
—	152 — 153	22	—	(a) 1859

(Eighteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	154 to 155	22	Victoria	(b) 1859
—	156 — 160	23	—	1860
—	161 — 164	24	—	1861
—	165 — 168	25	—	1862
—	169 — 172	26	—	1863
—	173 — 176	27	—	1864
—	177 — 180	28	—	1865

(Nineteenth Parliament.)

Vol.	181 to 184	29	Victoria	1866
—	185 — 189	30	—	1867
—	190 — 193	31	—	1867-8

(Twentieth Parliament.)

Vol.	194 to 198	32	Victoria	1868-9
—	199 — 203	33	—	1870
—	204 — 208	34	—	1871
—	209 — 213	35	—	1872
—	214 — 217	36	—	1873

(Twenty-First Parliament.)

Vol.	218 to 221	37	Victoria	1874
—	222 — 226	38	—	1875
—	227 — 231	39	—	1876
—	232 — 236	40	—	1877
—	237 — 242	41	—	1878
—	243 — 249	42	—	1878-9
—	250 & 251	43	—	(a) 1880

(Twenty-Second Parliament.)

Vol.	252 to 256	43	Victoria	(b) 1880
—	257 — 265	44	—	1881
—	266 — 273	45	—	(a) 1882
—	274 & 275	45	—	(b) 1882
—	276 to 283	46	—	1883
—	284 — 292	47	—	1884
—	293 — 301	48	—	1884-5

(Twenty-Third Parliament.)

Vol.	302 to 307	49	Victoria	(a) 1886

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament.)

Vol.	308 & 309	49	Victoria	(b) 1886
—	310 to 321	50	—	1887
—	322 — 332	51	—	1888
—	333 — 340	52	—	1889
—	341 — 348	53	—	1890
—	349 — 356	54	—	1890-1

Fourth Series.

(Twenty-Fourth Parliament—*cont.*)

Vol.	1 to 6	55	Victoria	1892

(Twenty-Fifth Parliament.)

Vol.	7	56	Victoria	1892
—	8 to 21	57	—	1893-4
—	22 — 29	57	—	1894
—	30 — 35	58	—	1895

(Twenty-Sixth Parliament.)

Vol.	36	59	Victoria	1895
—	37 to 44	59	—	1895-6
—	45 — 52	60	—	1897
—	53 — 65	61	—	1898
—	66 — 76	62	—	1899
—	77	63	—	1899
—	78 — 83	63	—	1900
—	84	63 & 64	—	1900
—	85 — 87	64	—	1900

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament.)

Vol.	88	64	Victoria	1900

REIGN OF EDWARD VII.

(Twenty-Seventh Parliament—*cont.*

Vol.	89	1	Edward VII.	1901
—	90 to 100	1	—	1901
—	101	1 & 2	—	1902
—	102 to 117	2	—	1902
—	118 to 128	3	—	1903
—	129 to 140	4	—	1904
—	141 to 151	5	—	1905

(Twenty-Eighth Parliament.)

Vol.	152 to 168	6	Edward VII.	1906
Vol.	169 to 173	7	„ „	1907

HIS MAJESTY'S PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF STATE, Etc.

SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN'S FIRST ADMINISTRATION, DECEMBER 1905.

THE CABINET.

Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury——Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.
Lord President of the Council——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Crewe.
Lord Chancellor——Rt. Hon. Lord Loreburn.
Chancellor of the Exchequer——Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, M.P.
Secretaries of State——
- Home Department——Rt. Hon. Herbert J. Gladstone, M.P.
- Foreign Affairs——Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Grey, Bt., M.P.
- Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
- War Office——Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane, M.P.
- India Office——Rt. Hon. John Morley, M.P.

First Lord of the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Chief Secretary for Ireland——Rt. Hon. A. Birrell, M.P.
Lord Privy Seal——Most. Hon. Marquess of Ripon.
President of the Board of Education——Rt. Hon. R. McKenna, M.P.
President of the Board of Trade——Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George, M.P.
President of the Local Government Board——Rt. Hon. John Burns, M.P.
President of the Board of Agriculture——Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Postmaster-General——Rt. Hon. Sydney Buxton, M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Fowler, M.P.
The Secretary for Scotland——Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair, M.P.
The First Commissioner of Works—Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt, M.P.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Under Secretary of State, Foreign Office——Lord Fitzmaurice.
Under Secretary of State, Home Office——Herbert Samuel, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, Colonial Office——Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill, M.P.
Under Secretary of State, India Office——C. E. Hobhouse, Esq., M.P.
Under Secretary of State, War Office——Rt. Hon. Earl of Portsmouth.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasury——George Whiteley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education——Thomas Lough, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Admiralty——Rt. Hon. E. Robertson, M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade——H. E. Kearley, Esq., M.P.
Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board——Dr. Macnamara, M.P.
Financial Secretary to the Treasury——Walter Runciman, Esq., M.P.
Financial Secretary to the War Office——T. R. Buchanan, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Treasury——
- J. A. Pease, Esq., M.P.
- Herbert Lewis, Esq., M.P.
- Captain Cecil Norton, M.P.
- J. M. F. Fuller, Esq., M.P.

Lords of the Admiralty——
- Admiral of the Fleet Sir John Fisher.
- Vice-Admiral Sir C. C. Drury.
- Rear-Admiral Sir H. B. Jackson.
- Rear-Admiral F. S. Inglefield.

Army Council——
- The Secretary of State for War [*in the Cabinet*].
- General Hon. Sir N. G. Lyttelton (Chief of the General Staff).
- General C. W. H. Douglas (Adjutant-General to the Forces).
- General Sir W. G. Nicholson (Quarter-Master-General to the Forces).
- Major-General Sir J. W. Murray (Master-General of the Ordnance).
- The Under Secretary of State for War.
- The Financial Secretary to the War Office.
- *Secretary.* The Permanent Under Secretary of State for War (Colonel Sir E. W. D. Ward).

The Civil Lord of the Admiralty——George Lambert, Esq., M.P.
Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland——Rt. Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen.
The Lord Advocate——Thomas Shaw, Esq., M.P.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster——In the Cabinet.
Attorney-General—— Sir J. Lawson Walton, M.P.
Solicitor-General——Sir W. S. Robson, M.P.
Paymaster-General——R. K. Causton, Esq., M.P.

OTHER OFFICERS OF STATE.

Lord Steward——
Comptroller of the Household——The Master of ELIBANK, M.P.
Treasurer of the Household——Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Bt., M.P.
Lord Chamberlain——Rt. Hon. Viscount ALTHORP.
Vice-Chamberlain——WENTWORTH BEAUMONT, Esq., M.P.
Master of the Horse——Rt. Hon. Earl of SEFTON.
Captain Yeoman of the Guard——His Grace the Duke of MANCHESTER.
Lords-in-Waiting——
- Earl GRANVILLE.
- Earl of GRANARD.
- Lord HAMILTON of DALZELL.
- Lord ACTON.
- Lord DENMAN.
- Lord COLEBROOKE.
- Lord SUFFIELD.

Judge Advocate-General——T. MILVAIN, Esq., K.C.

SCOTLAND.

Secretary for Scotland and Keeper of the Great Seal——Rt. Hon. JOHN SINCLAIR.
Lord High Constable——Earl of ERROL.
Lord Privy Seal——Marquess of BREADELBANE, K.G.
Master of the Household——Duke of ARGYLL, K.T.
Lord High Commissioner——Lord KINNAIRD.
Lord Clerk Register——His Grace the Duke of MONTROSE, K.T.
Lord Justice General——Rt. Hon. Lord DUNEDIN.
Lord Advocate——Rt. Hon. THOMAS SHAW, K.C.
Lord Justice Clerk——Rt. Hon. Lord KINSBURGH, C.B.
Solicitor-General——ALEXANDER URE, Esq., K.C.
Register General and Deputy Keeper Great Seal—Sir STAIR AGNEW, K.C.B.
Commanding Forces——Lt.-Gen. E. P. LEACH, C.B., C.V.O.

IRELAND.

Lord-Lieutenant——Earl of ABERDEEN, G.C.M.G.
Chief Secretary and Keeper of Privy Seal——Rt. Hon. A. BIRRELL, M.P.
Under Secretary——Rt. Hon. Sir A. MACDONNELL, G.C.S.I., K.C.V.O.
Private Secretaries——Lord HERSCHELL and WALTER CALLAN, Esq.
State Steward and Chamberlain——The Earl of LIVERPOOL.
Controller——Major LAMBART.
Lord Chancellor——Lord Justice WALKER.
Attorney-General——Rt. Hon. R. R CHERRY, K.C., M.P.
Solicitor-General——REDMOND BARRY, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Commanding the Forces——Gen. Lord GRENFELL, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

- Chairman of Committees——Rt. Hon. Earl of ONSLOW.
- Clerk of Parliaments——Sir HENRY J. L. GRAHAM, K.C.B.
- Deputy Clerk of Parliaments (Clerk Assistant)——Hon. E. P. THESIGER, C.B.
- Reading-Clerk and Clerk of Outdoor Committees——EDWARD HALL ALDERSON, Esq.
- Counsel to the Chairman of Committees——ALBERT GRAY, Esq.
- Chief Clerk and Clerk of Public Bills——A. HARRISON, Esq.
- Senior Clerks——
    - Clerk of the Journals——W. A. LEIGH, Esq.
    - Principal Clerk of Private Committees——J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq.
    - Principal Clerk, Judicial Department, and Taxing Officer of Judicial Costs——J. F. SKENE, Esq.
    - W. H. HAMILTON GORDON, Esq.
    - Peers' Printed Paper Office——C. L. ANSTRUTHER, Esq.
- Other Clerks——Hon. A. MCDONNELL ; A. H. ROBINSON, Esq. (Clerk of Private Bills and Taxing Officer of Private Bill Costs) ; H. P. ST. JOHN, Esq. ; V. M. BIDDULPH, Esq. ; Hon. E. A. STONOR ; H. J. F. BADELEY, Esq. ; C. HEADLAM, Esq. ; J. B. HOTHAM, Esq. ; E. C. VIGORS, Esq. ; A. TENNYSON, Esq. ; G. D. LUARD, Esq. ; and G. PROBY, Esq.
- Receiver of Fees and Accountant——T. A. COURT, Esq.
- Copyists——Mr. H. P. NORRIS and Mr. R. A. COURT.
- Messengers——Messrs. A. A. WORFELL, C. E. CHIZLETT, J. W. F LOCKE, J. MCMILLAN, G. BENNETT, G. T. PHILIP, W. S. WRIGHT.
- Librarian——EDMUND GOSSE, Esq., LL.D.
- Assistant Librarian——A. H. M. BUTLER, Esq.
- Attendant——Mr. A. N. STOTT.
- Examiners for Standing Orders——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE, Esq. ; Clerk ——H. C. BRAMWELL, Esq.
- Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod——Admiral Sir F. H. STEPHENSON, G.C.V.O., K.C.B.
- Yeoman Usher——Captain T. D. BUTLER, M.V.O.
- Serjeant-at-Arms——Lt.-Col. Rt. Hon. Sir FLEETWOOD I. EDWARDS, G.C.V.O., K.C B.
- Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms——S. HAND, Esq.
- Resident Superintendent——J. K. WILLIAMS, Esq.
- Shorthand Writer——W. H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq.
- Principal Doorkeepers——Messrs. W. CHANDLER, E. FOX, F. HOLMAN.
- First Class Assistants——Messrs. C. WALKER, J. HEDLEY, J. LANE, B. GALLOP.
- Second Class Assistants——Messrs. H. B. STREVENS, G. W. CROSS, W. STOPP.
- Third Class Assistants——Messrs. J. WOOLACOTT, A. A. EDNEY, J. F. BAUM.
- Messengers——Messrs. A. J. SOLMAN, C. CHAPMAN, W. PHILLIPS, W. W. MEATES, T. WHITEHEAD.
- Superintendent of Refreshment Rooms——Mr. W. CASBON.
- Inspector of Police attending the House of Lords——Mr. A. PALMER.
- Clerk of the Works, Houses of Parliament——Mr. P. E. RIDGE.
- Resident Engineer, Houses of Parliament——Mr. A. P. PATEY.

PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

- Clerk of the House of Commons——Sir COURTENAY PEREGRINE ILBERT, K.C.S.I., C.I.E.
- Clerk-Assistant——ARTHUR W. NICHOLSON, Esq.
- Second Clerk-Assistant——T. L. WEBSTER, Esq.
- Principal Clerks——
    - Public Bill Office, and Clerk of Fees——W. GIBBONS, Esq., C.B.
    - Clerk of the Journals——W. H. LEY, Esq.
    - Committee Office——F. ST. GEORGE TUPPER, Esq.
    - Private Bill Office——J. H. W. SOMERSET, Esq.
- Senior Clerks——C. V. FRERE, Esq. ; G. C. GIFFARD, Esq. ; Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart. ; S. L. SIMEON, Esq. ; ARTHUR I. DASENT, Esq. ; HORACE WEST, Esq.
- Assistant Clerks——HENRY A. FERGUSON-DAVIE, Esq. ; ARTHUR H. ELLIS, Esq. ; PERCY A. BULL, Esq. ; F. R. WILLIAMS WYNN, Esq. ; W. E. GREY, Esq. ; F. C. HOLLAND, Esq. ; J. W. G. BOND, Esq. ; H. C. DAWKINS, Esq. ; R. P. COLOMB, Esq. ; B. H. FELL, Esq. ; R. E. CHILDERS, Esq. ; J. SCOTT PORTER, Esq.
- Junior Clerks——F. C. BRAMWELL, Esq. ; W. T. LEGGE, Esq. ; C. R. TURNER, Esq. ; W. K. GIBBONS, Esq. ; W. P. JOHNSTON, Esq. ; J. BARLOW, Esq. ; Hon. H. R. C. BALFOUR ; R. N. BAILEY, Esq. ; G. F. M. CAMPION, Esq. ; S. DE LA POER BERESFORD, Esq. ; H. S. GREEN, Esq.

Serjeant-at-Arms——H. D. ERSKINE, Esq., C.V.O.
Deputy Serjeant——F. R. GOSSET, Esq.
Assistant Serjeant——W. H. ERSKINE, Esq.
Office Messenger——Mr. C. J. H. SHEARN.
Chaplain to the House——The Ven. Archdeacon BASIL WILBERFORCE, D.D.
Secretary to the Speaker——Hon. EDWARD GULLY, C.B.
Counsel to the Speaker——Hon. Sir E. CHANDOS LEIGH, K.C., K.C.B
Trainbearer——Mr. W. MURRELL.
Messenger——Mr. W. HOLT.
Collector of Fees on Private Bills——C. L. LOCKTON, Esq.
Clerk to Referees——Sir E. H. DOYLE, Bart.
Examiners of Private Bills——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; J. F. SYMONS JEUNE Esq
Taxing Master——C. W. CAMPION, Esq. ; Clerk——F. C. BRAMWELL, Esq.
Vote Office——
Principal Clerk——PHILIP SMITH, Esq.
Assistant Clerks——JOHN POYSER, Esq. ; W. K. SANDERSON, Esq.
Messenger——Mr. JOHN EDWARDS.
Librarian——R. C. WALPOLE, Esq. ; Assistant Librarian——A. E. A. W. SMYTH, Esq.
Clerks in Library——Messrs. J. R. CRIMP, WM. STEWART : Messengers——Messrs. A. FIRMIN, W. HAGUE.
Shorthand Writer——W. H. GURNEY SALTER, Esq.
Printers——
Journals——G. E. BRISCOE EYRE, Esq.
Votes——J. B. NICHOLS, Esq. (for H. M. Stationery Office.)
Postmaster——Mr. I. LINCOLN ; Hall Keeper——Mr. J. GLYNN.
Office Keeper——Mr. H. BULLOCK.
Office Clerk in Committee Office——Mr. T. FIELDEN MITCHELL.
Office Clerk in Journal Office——Mr. A. A. TAYLOR.
Messengers——Messrs. C. DAVIE, H. JONES, G. D. WELLER, J. ARMSTRONG, J. WOODWARD, J. IVORY, G. NORMAN, J. SURREY, A. SEPPLE.
Doorkeepers——Mr. M. INGLEFIELD and Mr. H. HAMBLING.
Messengers (1st Class)——Mr. C. WOODCRAFT, Mr. R. ROBERTSON, Mr. J. HILLS, Mr. J. SPRAGUE, Mr. A. ANDREWS, Mr. T. B. SPRAY, Mr. G. ANSTEY, Mr. J. H. DAY, Mr. J. HENDERSON, Mr. G. WAINWRIGHT, Mr. J. GUYATT.
Messengers (2nd Class)——Messrs. R. TURTLE, A. HASKELL, A. C. JOHNSON, G. CLAPPERTON, H. E. LININGTON, H. G. EMMETT, J. L. PHILIP, W. FINDLAY, W. MACDONALD, W. R. BRIMSON.
Superintendent of Members' Waiting Room——Mr. J. F. HENLEY ; Assistant——Mr W. BROADBENT ; Porters——Messrs. J. HART and G. FRY.
Inspector of Police attending the House of Commons——Mr. SCANTLEBURY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CLXXIII.

FIFTH VOLUME OF SESSION, 1907.

HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 24TH APRIL, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Page

Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill.—Read 2^{a}, and committed for Tuesday next 1

Basingstoke Gas Bill; KESWICK URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (WATER) BILL.—Read 2^{a}, and committed 1

Maidstone Gas Bill.—Read 2^{a}, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection 1

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1^{a}, and referred to the Examiners 1

Portishead District Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 4th and 18th of March last discharged, and Bill committed 1

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1877.—Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Prison Commissioners for Scotland, being the Sixty-eighth Annual Report on Prisons in Scotland 2

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.—Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 31st March, 1907.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table 2

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (COUNTY BOROUGH OF SWANSEA).—Order made by the council of the county borough of Swansea, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the county borough. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 2

Statute Law Revision Bill [H.L.].—Order of the Day for the House to be in Committee, read, and discharged 3

Rule Committee Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª to-morrow 3

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, 24TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

North East London Railway Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 3

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 6).—Ordered, That Sub-Divisional Inspector Arthur Sims do attend the Committee on Group 6 of Railway Bills to-morrow, at half-past eleven of the Clock 3

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill.—Reported [preamble not proved]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 4

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 5).—Sir LEWIS M'IVER reported from the Committee on Group 5 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 4

PETITIONS.

BUTTER AND MARGARINE BILL.—Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table 4

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Petition from Rhymney, in favour; to lie upon the Table 4

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against; From Edinburgh, and, Leith; to lie upon the Table 4

LICENSING ACTS.—Two petitions from Trafford Park, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table 4

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.—Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table 4

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against; From Arbroath; Dumbarton; Edinburgh; Glasgow; Mid Argyll; Portobello; Selkirk; and Shettleston; to lie upon the Table 4

Page

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour; From Annan; Arbroath (two); Banchory Ternaw; Bannockburn; Bervie; Bishopbriggs; Bonhill; Broughty Ferry; Callander; Calton; Camelon; Campbeltown; Chryston; Coalburn; Cuminestown; Dollar (two); Dumbarton; Dundee (six); Edinburgh (five); Falkirk (three); Fraserburgh; Galashiels; Garlieston; Girvan; Glasgow (eighteen); Gourdon Grangemouth; Greenock; Johnstone; Keith; Kilmarnock; Kincardine; Kirkintilloch (two); Larkhall (two); Lauder; Maxwelltown; Milltown; Milnathort; Motherwell; Muirkirk; Nitshill; Partick; Perth (two); Por; nneso Rosehearty; Saltcoats; Scotstown; Sorbie; Shettleston; Steventon, Stranraer (two); Uddington; Whiteinch (two); and, Wynde; to lie upon the Table 4

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL VETO) BILL.—Petition from Staveley, in favour; to lie upon the Table 5

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petition from Lewisham, against; to lie upon the Table 5

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petition for legislation; From Burnley and Hastings; to lie upon the Table 5

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) BILL.—Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table 5

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.—Petition from West Stockwith, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table 5

SALE OF WHISKEY BILL.—Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society against; to lie upon the Table 5

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF TRADE (REPORTS).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 23rd April; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 126] 5

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).—Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 5

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Copy presented of Order made by the Council of the County Borough of Swansea, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the County Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 6

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Prisons Commissioners for Scotland, being the Sixty-eighth Annual Report on Prisons in Scotland, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 6

AFRICA (No. 1, 1907).—Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the Independent State of the Congo (by Command); to lie upon the Table 6

EGYPT (No. 3, 1907).—Copy presented, of Despatch from the Earl of Cromer, respecting proposals of the Egyptian General Assembly [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 6

Apr. 24.] *Page*

Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series).—Copy presented of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Miscellaneous Series, No. 659 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 6

Trade Reports (Annual Series).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report. Annual Series, No. 3768 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 6

Local Contributions (Ireland).—Return ordered, " of all Moneys contributed out of the rates by the county council and other local bodies in each county in Ireland during the financial year 1906–7, for the purposes of schemes under the Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 170, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Ginnell*) .. 6

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Soldiers Employed by the Post Office.—Question, Mr. Steadman (Finsbury, Central); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 7

Transfer of Irish School Inspectors.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 8

Endowed Schools Commissioners and the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests for Ireland.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 9

The Land Policy of the Government—The Prime Minister and the Demand for Land.—Question, Mr. Lane Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. ..

Street Ambulances for London.—Question, Dr. Cooper (Southwark, Bermondsey); Answer Mr. Gladstone 15

Claims for Indian Lawyers for Judgeships.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. Morley 16

Army List and Colonial Militia and Volunteers.—Question, Sir H. Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Mr. Haldane 17

Small Bore Bullets.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Haldane 17

Conversion of Lee-Enfield Rifles for Use of Auxiliary Forces.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane 18

The Albert Hall Dinner to Colonial Premiers—The King's Colonials' Guard of Honour.—Question, Dr. Hazel (West Bromwich); Answer, Mr. Haldane 18

Sale of War Department Land at Bexhill.—Question, Mr. Courthope; Answer, Mr. Haldane 19

Cost per Man of Horse and Field Artillery under the New Scheme.—Question, Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Farnham); Answer, Mr. Haldane 19

Salaries of Irish Dispensary Doctors.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 20

Apr. 24.] *Page*

RELIGION OF ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY STATIONED AT TIPPERARY.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 21

DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE—PROPORTION OF ROMAN CATHOLICS AND PROTESTANTS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 21

CONDUCT OF SERGEANT COX, DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE.—Question, Mr. Patrick O'Brien (Kilkenny); Answer, Mr. Birrell 22

JUDICIAL RENT OF MR. DOLAN OF CARRICKCORVAGH.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 22

IRISH EDUCATION EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Birrell 23

ABOLITION OF SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Churchill 23

GREENWICH HOSPITAL PENSIONS—CASE OF DANIEL SYMES.—Question, Mr. Rendall (Gloucestershire, Thornbury); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 24

SHORTAGE OF NAVAL STOKERS.—Question, Mr. Nield; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 24

POLITICAL INFLUENCE AND CIVIL SERVICE PROMOTION.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Runciman 25

MEMORIAL OF CUSTOMS ASSISTANTS CLERKS.—Question, Sir William Bull (Hammersmith); Answer, Mr. Runciman 25

POOR LAW CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. L. Haslam (Monmouth Boroughs); Answer, Mr. John Burns 25

APPLICATIONS FOR POOR LAW RELIEF—PRODUCTION OF MARRIAGE CERTIFICATE.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. John Burns 26

SUPPLY OF STIMULANT—PRISONERS AT NEWTOWNARDS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 26

ALIENS NATURALISED—SUGGESTED REDUCTION OF FEES.—Question, Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 27

ACCIDENT ON STEAMSHIP "HYSON" AT LIVERPOOL.—Question, Mr. C. Duncan (Barrow-in-Furness); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 28

PAYMENT OF INSTALMENTS OF GUARANTEED LAND STOCK.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Asquith 28

PENSIONS OF WIDOWS OF INDIAN OFFICERS RESIDENT IN ENGLAND AND INDIA.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Morley .. 29

WOMEN ON LOCAL BODIES.—Question, Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 29

Apr. 24.] *Page*

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Channel Fleet Cruise.—Question, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) .. 30

Battleship Gun Reserve.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 30

The Home Fleet.—Question, Mr. Nield; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson .. 30

Rosyth.—Question, Mr. Arthur Lee (Hampshire, Fareham); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 31

The Colonies and Deaf Mutes.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 31

Slavery on the Zanzibar Mainland.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Churchill 31

Australian Tariffs.—Question, Mr. Levy (Leicestershire, Loughborough); Answer, Mr. Churchill 32

New Hebrides Convention.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 32

The Hague Conference.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Runciman 33

Paddington Borough Council.—Question, Dr. Cooper (Bermondsey, Southwark); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 33

Imports of Arms and Ammunition.—Question, Mr. Mond (Chester); Answer, the President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) 34

Classification of Imports.—Questions, Mr. Mond, Mr. Myer (Lambeth, N.), Mr. Chiozza Money (Paddington, N.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. 34

Foreign Trusts and the British Meat Trade.—Question, Sir William Bull (Hammersmith); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 36

The Wreck of the Jebba.—Question, Mr. Mildmay (Devonshire, Totnes); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 36

Irish Light Boards.—Question, Mr. J. Macveagh (Down, S.); Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 37

Housing of the Working Classes.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) .. 38

Halsall Charity. — Questions, Sir G. Kekewich (Exeter), Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Education (Mr. Lough, Islington, W.) 39

Apr. 24.] *Page*

NATIONAL PHYSICAL LABORATORY.—Question, Mr. Nield; Answer, Mr. Runciman 40

CROWN LANDS.—Question, Mr. H. H. Marks (Kent, Thanet); Answer, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) .. 40

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS—SHEPHERDS BUSH PROPERTY.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answer, Mr. Tomkinson (Cheshire, Crewe) 41

BEITH ACADEMY, AYRSHIRE.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 42

SCOTTISH APPEALS TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College); Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs) 42

WESTMEATH EVICTED TENANTS' INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) .. 43

COLONEL SMYTHE'S COLLINSTOWN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 43

IRISH CHARITABLE FOUNDATION.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 44

BARRY ESTATE, KNOCKSNAGREE, COUNTY CORK.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 44

BLACKLION TENANCY DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Birrell 45

GLENLEIGH AND KILLOUGHIN EVICTED TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell (Kerry, W.), Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answers, Mr. Birrell 46

KERRY EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Thomas O'Donnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 46

ESTATES COMMISSIONERS INSPECTORS IN COUNTY CORK.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 47

WATERVILLE INDUSTRIAL CLASS.—Question, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 48

AGRARIAN OUTRAGES IN KING'S COUNTY.—Questions, Mr. Haviland Burke (Kings County, Tullamore), Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 48

MISS FFRENCH'S MONIVEA (GALWAY) ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Hogan (Tipperary, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 49

Apr. 24.] Page

KNOCKLONG LABOURERS' COTTAGES SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Meehan (Cork County, Mid); Answer, Mr. Birrell 50

LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY WEXFORD.—Question, Mr. Ffrench (Wexford, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 51

IRISH UNIVERSITY SCHEME.—Questions, Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.), Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 51

FAY'S CAVAN AND MEATH ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Sheehy (Meath, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 52

TONGALEE FARM DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 53

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 54

EDENDERRY UNION TENDERS.—BOYCOTT OF ENGLISH FARMS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 54

BAGOT ESTATE—COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. John Roche; Answer, Mr. Birrell 55

IRISH COUNCIL BILL.—Questions, Mr. Sloan, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 55

KILLARNEY LAKE BOATS.—Question, Mr. Sloan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 56

IRISH LAND PURCHASE FINANCE.—Question, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 56

IRISH TRADE STATISTICS.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Birrell 57

COOSCROUM SLIP, KERRY.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 57

EVIDENCE ON BRAND FOR IRISH CURED FISH.—Question, Mr. Boland; Answer, Mr. Birrell 57

IRISH LAND PURCHASE DELAYS.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 58

LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEME APPEALS.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Birrell 58

CRANAGH FARM ROSCOMMON.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Flavin; Answer, Mr. Birrell 59

BALLINA MEDICAL OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale.; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 60

Apr. 24.]

Page

BALLYMONEY LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEME.—Question, Mr. Glendinning (Leitrim, N). ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 60

TARSFIELD ESTATE (CORK) EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Captain Donelan (Cork, E.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 61

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—INCOME.—Question, Mr. J. M'Veagh ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 61

DOWRA (CAVAN) DISTURBANCES.—Questions, Mr. Meysey-Thompson (Staffordshire, Hansworth) and Viscount Kennedy ; Answers, Mr. Birrell 62

MR. MITCHELL MURPHY'S MACROOM ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Sheehan, Captain Donelan ; Answers, Mr. Birrell 63

NORTH ANTRIM INCOME TAX APPEALS.—Question, Mr. Glendinning ; Answer, Mr. Runciman 64

IRISH LAND PURCHASE ACT.—Question, Mr. Ginnell ; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 64

IRISH LAND PURCHASE FUND.—Questions, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.), Captain Craig, Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) ; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs), and Mr. Runciman 64

WESTMEATH DEATH DUTY GRANTS.—Question, Sir Walter Nugent (Westmeath, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Runciman 68

NEW YORK PEACE CONGRESS.—Question, Mr. Rees ; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 69

STANDING ORDERS AND BLOCKING MOTIONS.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) ; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 69

LONDON TRAFFIC.—Question, Sir William Bull (Hammersmith), Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central) ; Mr. Bowerman (Deptford) ; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 69

GOVERNMENT VALUATION BILLS.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood ; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 70

THE LAND POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT—THE PRIME MINISTER AND THE DEMAND FOR LAND.—Question, Mr. Lane-Fox (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash) ; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 70

WELSH CHURCH COMMISSION.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil) ; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 71

NEW BILL.

MORTGAGE OF PREMISES BILL.—" To amend the Law in regard to the Mortgaging of Premises containing trade machinery," presented by Mr. Joseph Walton ; supported by Sir William Holland, Mr. Crombie, and Mr. Parkes ; to be read a second time upon Monday, 24th June, and to be printed. [Bill 167] .. 72

Apr. 24.] *Page*

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

INCOME TAX.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Income Tax shall be charged for the year beginning the 6th day of April, 1907, at the rate of one shilling in the pound."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. Hicks Beach (*Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury*) 72
Mr. Snowden (*Blackburn*) 76
Mr. Evans (*Glamorganshire, Mid.*) 83
Mr. Victor Cavendish (*Derbyshire, W.*) 90
Mr. McCrae (*Edinburgh, E.*) 96
Mr. J. F. Mason (*Windsor*) 101
Mr. Sears (*Cheltenham*) 104
Mr. Bowles (*Lambeth, Norwood*) 106
Mr. Chiozza Money (*Paddington, N.*) 112
Sir William Bull (*Hammersmith*) 119

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'one shilling,' and to insert the words 'eleven pence.'"—(*Sir William Bull.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'one shilling,' stand part of the proposed Resolution."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (*Mr. Asquith; Fifeshire, E.*) 120
Mr. Jesse Collings (*Birmingham, Bordesley*) 120

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 314; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 141.)

Original Question again proposed.

Mr. Smeaton (*Stirlingshire*) 125
Mr. Hunt (*Shropshire, Ludlow*) 127
Mr. Theodore Taylor (*Lancashire, Radcliffe*) 131
Mr. Markham (*North Rushcliffe*) 133

Question put and agreed to

Estate Duty.

2. Resolved, That in the case of persons dying on or after the nineteenth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, the rates of estate duty under section seventeen of the Finance Act 1894, be amended so that—

Where the Principal Value of the Estate.				Estate Duty shall be payable at the rate per cent. of	Instead of
Exceeds— £			£		
150,000	and does not exceed		250,000	Seven pounds - - -	Six pounds ten shillings
250,000	,,	,,	500,000	Eight pounds - - -	Seven pounds
500,000	,,	,,	750,000	Nine pounds - - -	Seven pounds ten shillings
750,000	,,	,,	1,000,000	Ten pounds - - -	Seven pounds ten shillings
1,000,000	,,	,,	1,500,000	Ten pounds on one million and eleven pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
1,500,000	,,	,,	2,000,000	Ten pounds on one million and twelve pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
2,000,000	,,	,,	2,500,000	Ten pounds on one million and thirteen pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
2,500,000	,,	,,	3,000,000	Ten pounds on one million and fourteen pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
3,000,000 - - - - - -				Ten pounds on one million and fifteen pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds

—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Income-tax (Inclusion of all Offices and Employments in Schedule E).

3. Resolved, That the income-tax charged on offices or employments of profit, whether public or not, be charged under Schedule E in the Income-Tax Act, 1853.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Income-tax (Limitation on the Aggregate Amount of Deductions or Repayments for Wear and Tear).

4. Resolved, That no deduction or repayment be allowed in any year in respect of the diminished value, by reason of wear and tear, of any machinery or plant which, when added to the deductions or repayments allowed on that account in previous years, will make the aggregate amount of the deductions or repayments exceed the actual cost of the machinery or plant.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Apr. 24] *Page*

Income-Tax (Abolition of Repayments in respect of Assessment on Average Income).

5. Resolved, That any abatement, relief, or repayment of income-tax under section one hundred and thirty-three of the Income-Tax Act, 1842, as amended by section six of the Revenue Act, 1865, shall cease.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Income-Tax (Assessment on Trades, etc., recently commenced).

6. Resolved, That income-tax charged under Schedule D in the Income-Tax Act, 1853, on professions, trades, or vocations shall, in the case of professions, trades, or vocations which have been set up or commenced within the three years on which the average income is to be computed under the Income-Tax Acts or within the year of assessment, be charged with reference to the actual profits or gains arising in the year of assessment.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow. Committee to sit again To-morrow.

LOCAL TAXATION GRANTS [CONSOLIDATED FUND].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient that the following grants to Local Taxation Accounts, namely—

(1) The Estate Duty grants paid under Section 19 of the Finance Act, 1894; and

(2) The Agricultural Rates grant paid under Section 2 of the Agricultural Rates Act, 1896; and

(3) The Scottish Agricultural Rates grant paid under Section 3 of the Agricultural Rates, Congested Districts, and Burgh Land Tax Relief (Scotland) Act, 1896,

instead of being paid out of the revenues out of which they are payable under the present law, be charged on and paid out of the Consolidated Fund, but in the case of the grants which are payable during the continuance of any temporary Act, only so long as that Act is continued, and that where under the present law the proceeds of any duties are paid to any local taxation account, a sum equal to the proceeds of those duties at their present rates be paid to that account out of the Consolidated Fund, and the actual proceeds of the duties be paid into the Exchequer.—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

SIR HORACE PLUNKETT.

Mr. Murphy (*Kerry, E.*) 136
Mr. Mooney (*Newry*) 140

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the position of Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture in Ireland was intended by Parliament to be and in fact is a Ministerial and Parliamentary office, properly vacated upon a change of Government, and that the retention of that office by a political opponent of the Government of the day is undesirable as a permanent arrangement."—(*Mr. Murphy.*)

Mr. Brooke (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley) 144

Sir F. Channing (Northamptonshire, E.) 147

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out from ' that,' to end and insert ' in view of the continued confidence expressed in the policy of Sir Horace Plunkett by the Council of Agriculture, two-thirds of whose members are directly appointed by the county councils of Ireland, it is inadvisable, before the House has had an opportunity of considering carefully the Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the organisation and working of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, to make any change in Sir Horace Plunkett's tenure of the Vice-Presidency."—(*Mr. Brooke.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) 149
Mr. Butcher (Cambridge University) 154
Mr. John Redmond (Waterford) 159
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 161
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 167
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 171

Question put, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House divided :—Ayes, 247 ; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 142.)

Main Question again proposed.

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon Mr. JOHN REDMOND rose in his place, and claimed to move, " That the Question be now put."

Question, " That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Main Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Resolved, " That the position of Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture in Ireland was intended by Parliament to be, and in fact is, a Ministerial and Parliamentary office, properly vacated upon a change of Government, and that the retention of that office by a political opponent of the Government of the day is undesirable as a permanent arrangement."—(*Mr. Murphy.*)

Apr. 25.] *Page*

Irish Tobacco Bill.—As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; to be read the third time to-morrow 176

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES [EXPENSES].—Committee to consider of authorising the payment out of money voted by Parliament for Army services of necessary expenditure incurred by associations in pursuance of any Act of the present session to provide for the reorganisation of His Majesty's military forces, and for that purpose to authorise the establishment of county associations and the raising and maintenance of a Territorial Force and to amend the Acts relating to the Reserve Forces (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*).. 176

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 25TH APRIL, 1907.

LUCAS PEERAGE.—Report from the Committee for Privileges made, and agreed to 177

WENTWORTH CANNING BLACKETT, BARON ALLENDALE.—Was (in the usual manner) introduced by virtue of a Patent, dated the 20th of July, 1906, his father, the first Baron, who was created by such Patent, never having taken his seat 177

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Southend Water Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 177

Electric Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª, and committed .. 177

Midland Railway Bill [H.L.]; York (Micklegate Strays) Bill [H.L.]; Sheffield Corporation Bill [H.L.]; City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill [H.L.]; Cavehill and Whitewell Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Aberdeen Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; viz.:—

L. Howard De Walden.
L. Sinclair.
L. Clements (E. Leitrim).
L. Seaton.
L. Ludlow (Chairman).

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly: The Committee to meet on Thursday next, at eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.. .. 177

Apr. 25.] *Page*

Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.]; Colne Valley Water Bill [H.L.]; Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Devon be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Biddulph; read and agreed to 177

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc) Bill; Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee to join with the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the said Bills; viz.:—

M. Winchester.
E. Manvers.
V. Cross.
L. Aberdare.
L. Leith of Fyvie

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly: Ordered that such Committee have power to agree with the Committee of the House of Commons in the appointment of a Chairman. Then a message was ordered to be sent to the House of Commons in answer to their message of the 26th of March last, to inform them of the appointment of the said Committee by this House, and to propose that the Joint Committee do meet in Committee Room A. on Thursday next at three o'clock 178

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.—Read 2ª (according to order), and committed.. 178

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Egypt No. 3 (1907).—Despatch from the Earl of Cromer respecting proposals of the Egyptian General Assembly 178

Africa No. 1 (1907).—Correspondence respecting the Independent State of the Congo 178

Trade Reports.

Annual Series: No. 3768. Italy (Rome.)

Miscellaneous Series: No. 659. (Danish system of Taxation) 178

Ireland Development Grant Act, 1903.—Report of the Lord-Lieutenant of all his proceedings under the Act, for the financial year ended 31st March, 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 179

Police (Counties and Boroughs, England and Wales).—Reports of His Majesty's inspectors of constabulary, for the year ended 29th September, 1906: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 179

Phosphorus Poisoning.

The Earl of Lytton 179
Earl Beauchamp 184

The Prime Minister and Small Holdings.

The Marquess of Lansdowne 185
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 195
The Earl of Onslow 203
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Ripon*) 207
The Marquess of Londonderry 210
The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 214
The Marquess of Lansdowne 218

County Councils and Small Holdings.

The Earl of Camperdown 219
Earl Carrington 221
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 221

Grants for Training Colleges.

Lord Monk Bretton 222
The Earl of Crewe 226

Rule Committee Bill [H.L.]—Read 3a (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons 227

House adjourned at half-past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, THURSDAY, 25TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

London County Council (Money) Bill (Standing Orders Applicable Thereto Complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—London County Council (Money) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 227

Private Bill [Lords] (Standing Order 68 not complied with).—Mr. Speaker laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 68 has not been complied with, viz. :—Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders 227

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 228

West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment 228

Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 228

London Port and Docks Bill (by order).—Order for resuming adjourned Debate on Amendment to Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.. 228

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill. — Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow 228

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow 228

West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords]; Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [Lords]; Burnley Corporation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments. Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 228

Brecon and Merthyr Tydvil Junction Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 228

Bristol Corporation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 228

Message from the Lords.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law with respect to the Court of Appeal." [Judicature Bill] [Lords.]

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, &c.) Bill and Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill.—That they have appointed a Committee consisting of Five Lords, to join with a Committee of the Commons, pursuant to Message of this House, to consider the Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, &c.) Bill and the Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, and propose that the said Joint Committee do meet in Committee Room A on Thursday next, at Three o'clock.

Lords' Message considered.

Ordered, That the Committee of this House do meet the Lords' Committee as proposed by their Lordships.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith 228

Apr. 25.] Page

PETITIONS.

Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill.—Petition from Chelsea, for alteration; to lie upon the Table 229

Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill.—Petition from Chelsea against; to lie upon the Table 229

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions against: From Kilsyth; Lanark; Rothesay; and Stranraer; to lie upon the Table .. 229

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions in favour: From Aberdeen (four); Bathgate; Bellshill; Berwick-upon-Tweed; Brechin; Campbeltown; Coatbridge; Dalziel; Dumfries (two); Dumfries and Maxwelltown; Dundee; Edinburgh (three); Falkirk (two); Forfar; Glasgow (seven); Govan; Grangemouth; Hilton; Lanark; Logerait; Montrose; Nairn; Neilston; North Berwick; North British District Temperance Committee; Peebles; Perth; Prestonpans; Rothesay; Saltcoats; Strathpeffer; Tough; Troon; Whiteinch Cross (two); and Wick; to lie upon the Table 229

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.—Petition from London, against; to lie upon the Table 229

Patents and Designs Bill.—Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table 229

Pauper Lunatics (Cost of Maintenance).—Petition from Bucklow, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 229

Women's Enfranchisement Bill.—Petition from North Medway, in favour; to lie upon the Table 230

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

Police (Counties and Boroughs, England and Wales).—Copy presented, of Reports of His Majesty's Inspectors of Constabulary for the year ended 29th September, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 128.] 230

Ireland Development Grant Act, 1903.—Copy presented, of Report of the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland of all his Proceedings under the Act, for the year ended 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 230

Occupiers of Farms (Scotland).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th December, 1906; *Mr. Sinclair*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 127.] 230

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

St. George's School, Ramsgate.—Question, Mr. Alden (Middlesex, Tottenham); Answer, Mr. McKenna 230

Lead Poisoning in Dockyards.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Edmund Roberston 231

Page

Estate of Mr. T. R. P. Phibbs, Collooney, Sligo.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 231

Killeenan Post Office.—Question, Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 232

Income-Tax.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Asquith .. 232

Financial Reserve.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, Mr. Morley 232

Gublaun Police.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 233

Irish Grants-in-Aid—Deductions.—Question, Mr. Kilbride (Kildare, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 233

Kilmallock Labourers' Cottages.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 234

Ballinageeragh Disturbances.—Question, Mr. Arkwright (Hereford); Answer, Mr. Birrell 235

Suffolk Artillery Militia Training.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Mr. Haldane 235

United States Pensions.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 236

Punishment of Youthful Offenders.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 236

High Sheriff's Expenses,—Question, Lt.-Colonel Philipps (Southampton); Answer, Mr. Runciman 240

Fatility of H.M.S. "Hyson".—Question, Mr. Steadman (Finsbury, Central); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 241

Liverpool Dock Regulations.—Question, Mr. C. Duncan; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 242

Irish Land Purchase—Borrowing Powers.—Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Cherry 242

Dublin Post Office.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Sidney Buxton 243

Eastern District Office—Casual Sorters.—Question, Mr. Steadman; Answer, Mr. Sidney Buxton 243

Cootehill Postal Arrangements.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 244

Luggage Insurance.—Question, Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 244

Apr. 25.] *Page*

TRADE STATISTICS—IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease, Answer Mr. Lloyd-George 244

AVERAGE PRICES.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease ; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. 245

TARGET PRACTICE ON THE SOUTH COAST.—Question, Mr. Scarisbrick (Dorsetshire, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 245

THE LANDING AND SLAUGHTER OF ANIMALS IN CHANNEL ISLANDS.—Question, Sir William Bull (Hammersmith) ; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 246

CONTINENTAL AGRICULTURE.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.) ; Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 247

CUSTOMS WATCHERS' OVERTIME PAY.—Question, Mr. Bowerman (Deptford) ; Answer, Mr. Runciman 247

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES CLASS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath) ; Answer, Mr. Runciman 249

IMPORTS OF PLAIN SPIRITS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease ; Answer, Mr. Asquith .. 249

POOR LAW CHILDREN.—Question, Mr. W. Priestley (Bradford, E.) ; Answer, Mr. John Burns 250

LONGFIELD ESTATE, BALLYCLOUGH.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 253

GEEVAGH DISTURBANCE.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 253

LOUGHRY MANOR, TYRONE.—Question, Mr. Kettle ; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 254

BELFAST POLICE INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. J. Devlin (Belfast, W.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 255

DOWNPATRICK FAIRS.—Question, Mr. Sloan (Belfast, S.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 255

LICENSING BILL.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh ; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 255

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

THE COASTGUARD.—Questions, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow), Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) ; Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty .. 256

GERMAN BATTLESHIPS.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (LynnRegis) ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 256

THE MEDITERRANEAN FLEET.—Question, Mr. Bellairs ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 257

INDIAN LEGISLATIVE COUNCILS.—Question, Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley) 258

ARBUTHNOT AND COMPANY'S BANKRUPTCY.—Question, Mr. Smeaton ; Answer, Mr. Morley 258

Apr. 25.]

Page

BENGAL EDUCATION STAFF.—Question, Mr. McCallum (Paisley); Answer, Mr. Morley 259

INDIAN RAILWAY BOARD.—Questions, Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central), Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answers, Mr. Morley 260

CALCUTTA IMPROVEMENTS.—Question, Mr. E. Price; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 260

AUSTRALIA—OLD-AGE PENSIONS AND EXPENDITURE ON DEFENCE.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 261

COLONIAL CONFERENCE AND PREFERENTIAL TRADING.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington), Mr. Lyttelton (St. George's, Hanover Square), Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend), Mr. Hunt; Answers, Mr. Churchill and The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman) 261

MACEDONIA.—Question, Dr. Dutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 263

TURKISH CUSTOMS DUTIES.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 263

THE BAHR-EL-GHAZAL.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. 264

CANADIAN TARIFFS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. 264

MESOPOTAMIA OIL CONCESSIONS.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 265

REGISTERED COMPANIES IN THE UNITED STATES.—Question, Mr. Vivian (Birkenhead); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 265

PERSIA AND GERMANY.—Question, Mr. Bowles; Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. 266

EGYPT.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 266

THE SOUDAN.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey .. 266

SYRIANS IN THE EGYPTIAN CIVIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 267

EGYPTIAN CIVIL SERVICE BOARD OF SELECTION.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 267

GREAT BRITAIN AND RUSSIA AND PERSIA.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Sir Edward Grey 268

HAGUE CONFERENCE—BRITISH GOVERNMENT.—Question, Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answer Sir Edward Grey 268

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS IN EGYPT.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 268

Apr. 25.]

Page

OLD-AGE PENSIONS.—Questions, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston).. Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby), Mr. Lonsdale, and Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan); Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) 269

PRIVILEGE CABS.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) .. 271

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Questions, Captain Craig (Down, E.), Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil), Mr. William Abraham (Glamorganshire, Rhondda), Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.), Mr. W. E. Harvey (Derbyshire, N.E.), Mr. Evelyn Cecil (Aston Manor); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Gladstone 271

THE EDALJI INQUIRY.—Question, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 274

SCHOOLS OF AGRICULTURE.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire) 274

COST OF SCHOOL MAINTENANCE IN GLAMORGANSHIRE).—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Mr. McKenna 275

GLAMORGANSHIRE EDUCATION RATE.—Question, Mr. D. A. Thomas; Answer, Mr. McKenna 276

BRITISH MAIL VAN DRIVERS.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) .. 276

CANADIAN TARIFFS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, The Secretary of the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 277

BRAKES FOR STREET CARS.—Question, Mr. Bell (Derby); Answer, Mr. Kearley 278

ARBROATH DISASTER—TREATING RAILWAY EMPLOYEES.—Question, Mr Leif Jones; Answer, Mr. Kearsley .. ..

TECHNICAL CLASSES IN AGRICULTURE.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) .. 278

NATIONAL PHYSICAL LABORATORY.—Questions, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answers, Mr. Runciman 279

SATURDAY HALF-HOLIDAYS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 280

BRITISH MUSEUM READING ROOM.—Questions, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood), Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent), Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answers, Mr. Runciman 281

LAW OF NEWSPAPER LIBEL.—Questions, Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.); Answers, The Attorney-General (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.) 281

DOG POISONING IN SUTHERLANDSHIRE.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 282

Apr. 25.] *Page*

SCOTTISH ELECTORAL LIST.—Question, Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs); Answer, Mr. John Burns 283

IRISH UNIVERSITY SCHEME.—Questions, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham). Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.); Answere, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 283

KEOGH ESTATE, SLIGO.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 284

CASE OF THOMAS GAFFNEY, OF GAWRAN.—Questions, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.), Mr. Ashley; Answers, Mr. Birrell 284

LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY CORK.—Question, Mr. Gilhooley (Cork County, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 286

BELFAST FACTORY WORKERS.—Question, Mr. J. Devlin (Belfast, W.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 286

IRISH FACTORY INSPECTION.—Question, Mr. J. Devlin; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 287

POLITICAL PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 287

EMPIRE DAY.—Questions, Viscount Turnour, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.), Mr. Hunt; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 288

GOVERNMENT MESSENGERSHIPS.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 288

BOARDS OF EDUCATION AND AGRICULTURE.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 288

NAVAL POLICY.—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. 289

IRISH MEMBERS AND THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 289

IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION BILL.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 289

IRISH COUNCIL BILLS.—Question, Mr. Barrie; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 289

SCOTTISH COMMITTEE OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION.—Questions, Mr. Morton, Mr. Smeaton; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 290

SELECTION (SCOTTISH STANDING COMMITTEE).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection, That the following Members representing Scottish constituencies are appointed to serve on the Standing Committee for the consideration of all Public Bills relating exclusively to Scotland and committed to a Standing Committee:—The Lord Advocate, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. Robert Balfour, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Beale, Sir Arthur Bignold, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Caldwell, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Cleland, Sir Thomas Glen Coats, Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Sir Henry Craik, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Cross, Lord Dalmeny, Viscount Dalrymple, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Arthur Dewar, Apr. 25.] Page

Mr. John Dewar, Mr. Robert Duncan, the Master of Elibank, Mr. Erskine, Mr. Esslemont, Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. Findlay, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. John Gulland, Mr. Secretary Haldane, Mr. Leicester Harmsworth, Mr. John Henderson, Mr. John Deans Hope, Sir John Jardine, Mr. Laidlaw, Mr. Lamont, Mr. Murray Macdonald, Mr. John M'Callum, Mr. M'Crae, Sir Lewis M'Iver, Major M'Micking, Mr. Menzies, Mr. Molteno, Mr. Secretary Morley, Mr. James Murray, Mr. Morton, Mr. Pirie, Mr. Charles Price, Sir Robert Pullar, Dr. Rainy, Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Smeaton, Mr. Halley Stewart, Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Tennant, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Sir Andrew Torrance, Sir John Batty Tuke, Captain Waring, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Watt, Mr. Weir, Mr. Dundas White, Mr. Wilkie, Mr. Williamson, Mr. M'Kinnon Wood, and Mr. Younger.

Report to lie upon the Table 291

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure :—Mr. William Abraham (Cork), the Lord Advocate, Mr. Adkins, Mr. Harmood-Banner, Mr. Barnard, Mr. Barran, Mr. Beckett, Mr. Billson, Mr. Boland, Mr. Bowles, Mr. Brace, Mr. Bright, Viscount Castlereagh, Mr. Cave, Mr. Chance, Mr. Clynes, Mr. Cobbold, Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Charles Craig, Mr. Herbert Craig, Mr. Ellis Davies, Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Clement Edwards, Mr. Evans, Mr. George Faber (York), Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Flynn, Sir Henry Fowler, Mr. Gwynn, Mr. William Harvey, Mr. Harwood, Mr. James Haslam, Mr. Healy, Colonel Herbert, Mr. Higham, Mr. Hodge, Mr. Bateman Hope, Sir John Jardine, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, Mr. Lambton, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Lehmann, Sir Francis Lowe, Mr. Massie, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Napier, Mr. Nussey, Mr. Pickersgill, Sir Francis Powell, Mr. Rainy, Mr. Rees, Mr. Compton Rickett, Mr. Charles Roberts, Mr. Samuel Roberts, Mr. Soares, Mr. Solicitor-General, Sir Benjamin Stone, Mr. John Taylor, Mr. Thornton, Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Waldron, Mr. Walker, Mr. Joseph Walton, and Mr. Whitehead. 291

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee ; That they had added to Standing Committee A the following fifteen Members in respect of the Advertisements Regulation Bill : Lord Balcarres, Mr. Hart-Davies, Mr. Wyndham, Sir Charles Schwann, Mr. Butcher, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Beale, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Bell, Mr. Beauchamp, Mr. Bertram Straus, Dr. Shipman, Mr. King, Mr. Rendall, and Mr. Morrell.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee, That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee B, in respect of the Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill :—Mr. Burns, Dr. Macnamara, and Mr. Solicitor-General ; and had added the following eighteen Members in respect of the Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill :—Mr. Birrell, Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. Solicitor-General for Ireland, Mr. Walter Long, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Clancy, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Hayden, Mr. M'Hugh, Mr. O'Shee, Mr. Devlin, and Mr. T. P. O'Connor.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee, That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill) :—Sir Edward Strachey ; and

had added the following Sixteen Members (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill) :—Mr. Solicitor-General. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Maddison, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Collings, Mr. Meysey-Thompson, Viscount Turnour, Mr. Maclaren, Mr. Dundas White, Mr. Branch, Mr. Croydon Marks, Mr. Crossley, Mr. Astbury, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Agnew, and Sir Francis Channing.

Sir William Brampton Gurdon further reported from the Committee, That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A :—Mr. Rothschild ; and had appointed in substitution Mr. James Francis Mason.

Reports to lie upon the Table 292

Light on Vehicles Bill.—Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 129.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 129.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 168.] 293

Municiple Elections Bill.—"To amend The Municipal Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Act, 1884," presented by Mr. Cleland ; supported by Mr. M'Crae, Mr. Barnes, Major Coates, Mr. Younger, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. Adkins, and Mr. M'Kinnon Wood ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 170.] 293

Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill.—"To extend the Military Lands Acts to Naval and Marine Volunteers," presented by Mr. Edmund Robertson ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 171.] 293

Supply [6th Allotted Day].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. Emmott, Oldham, in the Chair.]

Navy Estimates, 1907–8.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,758,400, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expense of Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad, including the cost of Superintendence, Purchase of Sites, Grants in Aid, and other Charges connected therewith, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908."

The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Lambert, Devonshire, South Molton) 296
Mr. Arthur Lee (Hants Fareham) 300
Mr. Jenkins (Chatham) 308

Apr. 25.] Page

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item B be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Jenkins.*)

Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 310
Mr. Mond (Chester) 312
Captain Hervey (Bury St. Edmunds) 314
Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central) 315
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 316
Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis) 317
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 323
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 325
The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee) 328
Mr. Arnold-Forster (Croydon) 328
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) 329
Mr. E. H. Lamb (Rochester) 330
Major Anstruther Gray (St. Andrews Burghs) 331
Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow) 332
Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 332
Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent) 334
Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.) 335
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) 335
Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 335
Mr. Lambert 336
Mr. Arthur Lee 338

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 66; Noes, 271. (Division List No. 143.)

Original Question again proposed.

Sir Charles Dilke 341
Mr. Ashley 341
Sir F. Banbury 342
Mr. Edmund Robertson 344
Mr. Arthur Lee 344

Original Question put, and agreed to.

2. £837,900, Half-pay, Reserved, and Retired pay.

Motion made, and Question proposed—"That a sum, not exceeding £1,302,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expenses of Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908."

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

3. £370,900, Civil Pensions and Gratuities.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

London and North Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill (By Order).—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 345

Channel Tunnel Railway Bill (By Order).—Order for Second Reading read.

Sir William Holland (*Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham*) 345

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order be discharged and the Bill withdrawn."

Mr. Perks (*Lincolnshire, Louth*) 347
Mr. Lupton (*Lincolnshire, Sleaford*) 348

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill withdrawn.

London and North Western Railway Bill (By Order).—Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [19th March], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

> "To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, and add the words 'no Bill can be satisfactory to this House which confers increased powers on a railway company created by Act of Parliament which has subscribed out of its corporate funds to a Party organisation.'"—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The President of the Board of Trade (*Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs*) 349
Colonel Lockwood (*Essex, Epping*) 352
Mr. Clement Edwards (*Denbigh Districts*) 353
Mr. Trevelyan (*Yorkshire, W.R., Elland*) 354

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

Mr. Lea (*St. Pancras, E.*) 355
Mr. Harold Cox (*Preston*) 358
Mr. Micklem (*Hertfordshire, Watford*) 360
Mr. Bright (*Oldham*) 363
Mr. Hemmerde (*Denbighshire, E.*) 364
The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (*Mr. Kearley, Devonport*) 365
Mr. Herbert (*Buckinghamshire, Wycombe*) 367
Mr. Straus (*Tower Hamlets, Mile End*) 368
Colonel Lockwood (*Essex, Epping*) 368
Sir W. J. Collins (*St. Pancras, W.*) 369
Mr. Verney (*Buckinghamshire, N.*) 370

Main Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 209; Noes, 62. (Division List No. 144.)

Bill read a second time, and committed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at eighteen minutes after Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 26TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Taff Vale Railway Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 373

Boston Spa Gas Bill; Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 373

Great Northern and City Railway Bill.—As amended, to be considered upon Monday next 373

Swansea Harbour Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 373

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill; Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 373

PETITIONS.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.—Petition from Salisbury, against; to lie upon the Table 373

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Petitions in favour; from Digby; Eastwood; Gedling; New Hucknall; Selston; Sherwood; and Underwood Collieries; to lie upon the Table 373

ECCLESIASTICAL DISORDERS BILL.—Petition from Salisbury, against; to lie upon the Table 373

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) BILL.—Petition from Kilbucks, against; to lie upon the Table.. 373

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.—Petition from Salisbury, against; to lie upon the Table 373

JURORS' EXPENSES BILL.—Petition from Essex, in favour; to lie upon the Table 374

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL.—Petition from Forres, in favour; to lie upon the Table 374

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against: From Barrhead; Edinburgh and Leith: Glasgow; Partick; and West Kilpatrick; to lie upon the Table 374

Page

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Aberdeen (two); Alexandria; Alloa; Barrhead; Blairgowrie; Burnbank; Burra; Burra Isle; Cambuslang; Canisbay (two); Carluke; Clydebank (nine); Culbokie; Dalkeith (two); Dalmuir; Dumfries; Dumfries and Galloway; Duntocher; Edinburgh (eleven); Elgin; Fearn; Flotta; Fortrose; Fraserburgh; Galashiels; Gartsherrie; Glasgow (eight); Govan; Greenock (two); Hatton; Hawick; Inverness; Keiss; Kilkmahoe; Kirkwall (three); Lanark; Lauriston (two); Leuchars; Lochalsh; Lochee; Newton Mearns (three); Newport; Nitshill; Paisley (two); Partick; Perth (two); Peterhead; Prestwick; St. Andrews; Strathaven; Tain; Tayport; (two); Uddingston; and Yoker (two); to lie upon the Table 374

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petition from Salisbury, against; to lie upon the Table 374

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petition from Forres, in favour; to lie upon the Table 374

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petition from St. Albans, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 374

RAILWAY TICKETS BILL.—Petition from Forres, in favour; to lie upon the Table 374

SALE OF WHISKY BILL.—Petition from Forres, in favour; to lie upon the Table 375

WEEKLY REST DAY BILL.—Petition from Forres, in favour; to lie upon the Table 375

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883 (PROCEEDINGS).—Account presented, showing the Receipts and Expenditure on account of Bankruptcy Proceedings during the year ended 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 130] 375

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP ACT, 1890).—Account presented, showing Receipts and Expenditure on account of Proceedings during the year ended 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed.[No. 131] 375

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

IRISH LAND ACT—SECTION 2.—Question, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh (Fermanagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell.. 375

LONDON POSTAL SORTERS' OPEN EXAMINATION.—Question, Mr. Steadman (Finsbury Central); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 376

KINGSCOURT (COUNTY CAVAN) POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 376

IRISH VALUATION.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 376

PROMOTION IN THE GENERAL VALUATION OFFICE, DUBLIN.—Questions, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answers, Mr. Runciman 379

Apr. 26.] *Page*

Income Tax—Schedule E—Persons Resident Abroad.—Question, Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, Mr. Runciman 381

Carnarvon Castle—Maintenance and Upkeep.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Harcourt 382

Decrease of Population of Ulster.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Birrell 382

Irish Evicted Tenants—Reinstatement of Patrick Cormack and James Feehan.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 383

Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Philip Sweeney.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 384

Evans Estate, Killoman—Request under Section 40 of the Land Act, 1896.—Question, Mr. Dolan; Answer, Mr. Birrell 385

Irish Evicted Tenants—Application of Patrick Fitzpatrick.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 385

Irish School Teachers—Publication of Personal Details in Daily Report Book.—Question, Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell.. 385

Army Service and Civil Service Pensions.—Question, Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby); Answer, Mr. Haldane 386

Liquor Traffic Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. R. Balfour (*Lanarkshire, Partick*) 386

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. F. E. Smith (*Liverpool, Walton*) 394
Viscount Castlereagh (*Maidstone*) 403

Amendment proposed—

> "To leave out from the word 'that,' to the end of the Question, and add the words, 'this House declines to proceed further with a measure which will cause dislocation and insecurity amongst those engaged in the licensed victualling trade without any compensating advantage to the public, which leaves the right of supplying alcoholic liquor in clubs and dispensaries unrestricted, and which will deprive brewers, licensees, and the investing public of their property without compensation.' "—(*Mr. F. E. Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Page
Mr. Gulland (Dumfries Burghs) 406
Mr. C. B. Harmsworth (Worcestershire, Droitwich) 408
Mr. Charles Roberts (Lincoln) 410
Mr. Munro Ferguson (Leith Burghs) 415
Mr. A. C. Corbett (Glasgow, Tradeston) 418
Mr. Barnard (Kidderminster) 420
(Mr. Sherwell (Huddersfield) 421
Mr. Bottomley (Hackney, S.) 429
The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 434
Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) 435
Mr. Herbert Roberts (Denbighshire, W.) 438
Mr. Younger (Ayr Burghs) 439
Sir John Jardine (Roxburghshire) 443
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 443

Mr. R. Balfour rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided :—Ayes, 276 ; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 145.)

Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House divided :—Ayes, 262 ; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 146.)

Mr. R. Balfour claimed, "That the Main Question be now put."

Main Question put accordingly.

The House divided :—Ayes, 251 ; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 147.)

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the whole House."—(*Sir William Bull.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 75 ; Noes, 239. (Division List No. 148.)

Bill committed to a Standing Committee.

And, it being after half-past Five of the clock, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at twenty-two minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS : MONDAY, APRIL 29th, 1907.

Commission.—The following Bills received the Royal Assent :—

1. Army (Annual).

2. Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Port Seton Deviation) Order Confirmation.

Apr. 29.] *Page*

3. Galwey's Divorce.

4. Byrne's Divorce.

5. Royal Insurance Company 461

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with: South Wales Mineral Railway; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway

Also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with: Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) [H.L.]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 461

York (Micklegate Strays) Bill [H.L.].—A petition of Messrs. Sherwood and Company, of 7, Great George Street, Westminster, Parliamentary Agents, praying for leave to present a petition of the Freemen of the City of York, praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill, although the time limited by Standing Order No. 92 for presenting such petition has expired; read, and ordered to lie on the Table, and Standing Order No. 92 to be considered To-morrow in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said petition .. 461

Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill [H.L.].—Committed 461

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill; Taff Vale Railway Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners 461

West Riding Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Medway Lower Navigation Bill [H.L.].—Returned from the Commons agreed to 462

Southend-on-Sea Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, That it is not expedient to proceed further with the Bill; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 462

Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [H.L.].—The Lord Bishop of Birmingham (in his place) consented to the Bill 462

Baines' Name Bill [H.L.]; Royal Bank of Scotland Bill [H.L.]; King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed and sent to the Commons 462

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Pwllheli, was presented by the Earl Beauchamp (for the Lord Granard (*E. Granard*)); read 1ª, to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 40) 462

Apr. 29] *Page*

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill (No. 38); Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill (No. 39).—Brought from the Commons and read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners 462

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 2) Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, to enable the London County Council to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts, was presented by the Lord President (*E. Crewe*); read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 37) 462

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill; Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill.—Message from the Commons that they have ordered that the Committee appointed by them to join with the Committee of this House, to consider he said Bills, do meet the Lords' Committee in Committee Room A., on Thursday next, at Three o'clock, as proposed by their Lordships 462

PETITION.

COMPANIES BILL [H.L.].—Petition for amendment of; of Members of Stock Exchange; read and ordered to lie on the Table 463

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FEE FUND OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid on the Table the Annual Account of the Fee Fund of the House of Lords. The same was ordered to lie on the Table, and to be referred to the Select Committee on the House of Lords Offices. 463

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—No. 3769. United States (Porto Rico) .. 463

ARMY (VOLUNTEERS).—Annual Return of Volunteer Corps of Great Britain, for the year, 1906 463

WELLINGTON COLLEGE.—Report of the governors for the year ended 31st December, 1906, with accounts 463

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.—Annual Report for the year 1906 463

VIVISECTION (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Second Report of the Commissioners, and minutes of evidence, February to March, 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 463

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST: SPAIN AND BALEARIC ISLANDS).—The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 4) Warrant, 1907, dated 11th April, 1907 463

INDIA.—Minute by the Secretary of State for India extending the term of Sir James Lyle Mackay's office as a member of the Council of India 463

BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883 (PROCEEDINGS).—Account showing the receipts and expenditure on account of bankruptcy proceedings during the year ended 31st March, 1907 463

Apr. 29.] *Page*

Shop Hours Act, 1904 (Urban District of Acton].—Order made by the council of the urban district of Acton, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the urban district 464

Companies (Winding Up) Act, 1890.—Account showing receipts and expenditure on account of proceedings under the Companies (Winding-Up) Act, 1890, during the year ended 31st March, 1907.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 464

NEW BILL.

Merchant Shipping Acts Ammendment Bill [h.l.].—A Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts, 1894 to 1906, was presented by the Lord Ampthill; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday the 7th of May next. (No. 36) 464

Prohibition of Medical Practice by Companies Bill [h.l.]—[Second Reading].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Hylton 464

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Hylton.*)

The Earl of Halsbury 467

The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 468

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee.

Dental Companies (Restriction of Practice) Bill [h.l.]—[Second Reading].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Hylton 470

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Hylton.*)

The Earl of Crewe 470

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and referred to the Select Committee.

Destructive Insects and Pests Bill [h.l.]—[Second Reading].—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 471

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Earl Carrington*).

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill [h.l.]—[Second Reading].—Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

Earl Carrington 472

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Earl Carrington*).

Lord Ashbourne .. 473
The Earl of Harewood .. 473
The Earl of Denbigh .. 474
Lord Newton .. 475
Lord Barnard .. 475
Earl Carrington .. 476
Earl Cawdor .. 477
The Earl of Camperdown .. 477

Moved, That the debate be adjourned.—(*The Earl of Camperdown.*)

Lord Haversham .. 478
The Marquess of Lansdowne .. 478
The Earl of Denbigh .. 478
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) .. 478

On Question, debate adjourned.

DISSEMINATION OF NEWS IN WAR TIME.

Lord Ellenborough .. 479
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Lord Tweedmouth*) .. 480
Earl Cawdor .. 482

THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.

The Earl of Wemyss .. 482
The Under-Secretary of State for War (*The Earl of Portsmouth*) .. 483
The Marquess of Salisbury .. 484
The Earl of Portsmouth .. 486

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 29TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

COMMISSION.—Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and, having returned:

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to—

1. Army (Annual) Act, 1907.

2. Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Port Seton Deviation) Order Confirmation Act, 1907.

3. Royal Insurance Company's Act, 1907.

4. Galwey's Divorce Act, 1907.

5. Byrne's Divorce Act, 1907 .. 487

Apr. 29.] *Page*

NEW WRIT.—For the County of Surrey (North-Eastern or Wimbledon Division) in the room of Charles Eric Hambro, esquire (Manor of Northstead).—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood*) 487

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 487

London and North Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill; North East London Railway Bill; Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill; South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 487

Shanklin Gas Bill.—As amended, considered ; to be read the third time .. 488

Borax Consolidated Bill [Lords]; Devonport Corporation Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 488

Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill [Lords]; Middlesbrough Corporation Bill [Lords]; Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill; Society of Apothecaries of London Bill [Lords]; Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill [Lords]; Tees Conservancy Bill [Lords]; Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 488

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill.—Reported, with Amendments ; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 488

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.—Petitions in favour : From Dunnikies ; and Dysart ; to lie upon the Table 488

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour : From Burntisland ; Corstorphine ; Dumbarton ; Dunoon ; Dysart ; Ellenabeich ; Glasgow (two) ; Kinghorn ; Kirkcaldy (three) ; Kirtle ; Largs ; Pollokshaws (three) ; Rothesay ; and Rutherglen ; to lie upon the Table 488

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition of the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, against ; to lie upon the Table 488

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

VIVISECTION (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy presented, of Second Report of the Commissioners, and Minutes of Evidence, February to March, 1907 [by Command] ; to lie upon the Table 488

Apr. 29.]

Page

WELLINGTON COLLEGE.—Copy presented, of Report of the Governors of Wellington College for the year ending 31st December, 1906, with Accounts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 488

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Urban District Council of Acton, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the Urban District [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 488

METROPOLITAN POLICE.—Accounts presented, of the Metropolitan Police and the Police Pension Funds for the year ended 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 132] 489

ARMY (VOLUNTEER CORPS).—Copy presented, of Annual Return of the Volunteer Corps of Great Britain for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 489

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3769 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 489

EAST INDIA COUNCIL (REAPPOINTMENT OF SIR JAMES LYLE MACKAY.)—Copy presented, of Minute by the Secretary of State for India, extending the term of Sir James Lyle Mackay's office as Member of the Council of India [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 48

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.—Copy presented, of Twenty-fifth Report of the Royal University of Ireland, being for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 489

LOAN FUND BOARD (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Sixty-ninth Annual Report, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 489

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST).—Copy presented, of the Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 4) Warrant, 1907, dated 11th April, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 489

INTER-IMPERIAL TRADE.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th April; *Mr. Harold Cox*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 133] 489

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACT, 1888.—Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade, under Section 24 (4) of the Act, on the Schedule of Maximum Tolls and Charges to be made applicable to the New Junction Canal, authorised by the Aire and Calder and River Dun Navigation Junction Canal Act, 1891 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 134] .. 489

BRITISH AND FOREIGN TRADE AND INDUSTRY.—Return ordered, "showing, for each of the years 1904 to 1906, the value of the imports, exports (British and Irish), and re-exports of articles wholly or mainly manufactured, distinguishing, so far as possible, (*a*) articles completely manufactured and ready for consumption; (*b*) articles manufactured but requiring to pass through some process of adaptation or combination before entering into consumption; (*c*) articles partly manufactured (in continuation of the information given in the second series of Memoranda, etc., relating to British and Foreign Trade and Industry, Cd. 2337, of Session 1904)."—(*Mr. Murray Macdonald*) .. 490

Apr. 29.] *Page*

CASUALTIES TO SHIPS.—Return ordered, "of Casualties to Ships on the Navy List, viz.: (1) Casualties to ships, including all cases of collision or grounding; (2) Casualties to engines, during the year ending the 31st day of December, 1906, showing the date, the name, and class of the ship damaged, the nature of the accident, time under repair, and the result of any inquiry that may have been held into the circumstances, specifying if a Court-Martial was held (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 319, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Bellairs.*) 490

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT FORMS.—Question, Sir William Bull (Hammersmith): Answer, Mr. Asquith 491

IRISH POLICE AND CLOVENDEN HIBERNIANS' BANDS.—Question, Mr. J. Devlin (Belfast, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 491

IRON AND STEEL IMPORTS INTO CANADA—DUTY ON BRITISH AND FOREIGN GOODS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 492

WAGES IN SPINNING FACTORIES IN LANCASHIRE AND BELFAST.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Kearley 493

USE OF CLOGHER COURTHOUSE FOR FORESTERS' CONCERT.—Question, Mr. T.W. Russell (Tyrone, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 494

CONVICTIONS OF SOLDIERS ON FOREIGN SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 494

ECCLESIASTICAL DISORDERS.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 497

ROYAL COMMISSION ON MOTOR CARS—GOVERNMENT ACTION.—Question, Colonel Warde (Kent, Medway); Answer, Mr. John Burns 497

ST. LUCIA RIOTS—NEAREST WARSHIP.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 498

EROSION OF BOTTOM PLATES OF H.M.S. "ANTRIM."—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 498

RE-DECORATION OF BRITISH MUSEUM READING ROOM.—Question, Mr. Haddock (Lancashire, North Lonsdale); Answer, Mr. Harcourt 498

EMPLOYMENT FOR WORKMEN DISCHARGED FROM WOOLWICH ARSENAL.—Question, Mr. Atherley Jones (Durham, N.W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 502

FINANCE ACT, SECTION 20, AND THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping); Answer, Mr. Churchill 503

THE WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC.—Question, Sir Howard Vincent (Sheffield, Central); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 504

LAND UNDER CROPS IN GREAT BRITAIN, BELGIUM, FRANCE, GERMANY, AND IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.); Sir Edward Grey 504

Apr. 29.] *Page*

REMOVAL OF PLANT HOUSES AND FORCING FRAMES FROM KENSINGTON GARDENS. —Question, Sir George Fardell (Paddington, S.); Answer, Mr. Harcourt .. 505

GUARDIANS AS MAGISTRATES ADJUCATING IN POOR LAW CASES.—Question, Mr. Brunner (Lancashire, Leigh); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 505

HOURS OF LABOUR IN MINES.—Question, Mr. Glover (St. Helens); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 505

SENTENCE FOR THEFT OF INK POT AT PARLIAMENT STREET POST OFFICE.—Question, Mr. Lehmann (Leicestershire, Market Harborough); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 506

COST OF UPKEEP AT HARROW SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Mckenna 506

AGE LIMIT IN THE POST OFFICE EXCISE TAXES AND CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 506

PROMOTION OF SECOND DIVISION OF CLERKS.—Question, Mr. Cleland; Answer, Mr. Runciman 507

ISSUE OF VACCINATION ORDER.—Question, (Mr. Lupton, Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answer, Mr. John Burns 501

REVENUE RESTRICTIONS ON MANUFACTURE OF RUM AND BRANDY.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, Mr. Asquith 508

SHORTAGE OF ROLLING STOCK ON INDIAN RAILWAY.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, Mr. Morley 509

SALMON FISHERIES OF THE RIVERS BANN, ERNE AND FOYLE.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 509

AMENDMENT OF IRISH FISHERIES LAWS.—Question, Mr. Barrie; Answer, Mr. Birrell 511

DEVELOPMENT OF FISHING INDUSTRY AT MULLAGHMORE.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 511

PURCHASE OF THE ESTATE OF MR. CHARLES O'RORKE, COUNTY GALWAY.—Question, Mr. Hazleton (Galway, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 512

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD AND THE APPOINTMENT OF MR. T. DANIEL AS ARCHITECT TO THE BAILLIEBOROUGH RURAL DISTRICT COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Samuel Young (Cavan, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 512

EVICTED TENANTS AT BAILIEBOROUGH, COUNTY CAVAN.—Question, Mr. S. Young; Answer, Mr. Birrell 513

SALE OF ESTATES OF J. C. DELMAGE OF GLENSHARROLD.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 514

IRISH POOR LAW RETURNS.—Question, Dr. Ambrose (Mayo, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 514

Apr. 29.] *Page*

HOLDINGS SOLD UNDER THE IRISH LAND ACT.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 515

STOCK EXCHANGE GAMBLING.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 516

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

ARMY PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox (Preston); Answer, the Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddingtonshire) 516

ARMY ESTABLISHMENTS.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answer, Mr. Haldane 517

GARRISON ARTILLERY.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 517

RIFLES FOR RIFLE CLUBS.—Questions, Mr. Carlile (Hertfordshire, St. Albans), Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answers, Mr. Haldane 518

CONVICTIONS OF SOLDIERS ON FOREIGN SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 519

ARMY COURTS MARTIAL.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. Haldane 519

SOLDIERS AND EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 520

SOUTH AFRICAN CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Mr. Haldane 520

BRITISH GARRISON IN SOUTH AFRICA.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Mr. Haldane 521

SIR PERCY FITZPATRICK AND THE BRITISH GARRISON.—Question, Mr. Harold Cox; Answer, Mr. Haldane 521

FIFE GARRISON ARTILLERY—GUNNER GROSSAN.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs); Answer, Mr. Haldane 522

VOLUNTEERS AND THE NEW ARMY SCHEME.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane 522

GARRISON ARTILLERY MILITIA.—Questions, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth), Mr. Arthur Lee; Answers, Mr. Haldane 523

NEW COUNTY ASSOCIATION SCHEME.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 523

HONORARY RANKS ON RETIREMENT.—Question, Sir Robert Hobart (Hampshire, New Forest); Answer, Mr. Haldane 524

HAMILTON BARRACKS.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Haldane 525

THE WOOLWICH ARSENAL DISCHARGES.—Questions, Mr. Pike Pease, Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent), Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answers, Mr. Haldane.. 525

Page

THE NAIROBI INCIDENT.—Question, Mr. Carlile; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 527

ST. LUCIA RIOTS.—Questions, Mr. Mitchell-Thompson, (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Mr. Lonsdale, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answers, Mr. Churchill 528

FOREIGN OFFICE MESSENGERSHIP.—Question, Mr. Scott; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 529

THE MIKADO.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 529

TURKISH CUSTOMS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Runciman 530

ALIENS.—Questions, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool), Sir W. Evans Gordon (Tower Hamlets, Stepney), Mr. Byles (Salford, N.); Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 530

PURLEY RAILWAY OUTRAGE.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, Mr. Gladstone .. 531

EMPLOYMENT OF YOUNG PERSONS.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 531

ASSISTANT FACTORY INSPECTORS.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 532

JONES' HOMES, SANDGATE.—Question, Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 532

EQUALISATION OF LONDON RATES.—Question, Dr. Cooper (Southwark Bermondsey); Answer, Mr. John Burns 533

PARISH OVERSEERS AND THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT.—Question, Mr. Hunt; Answer, Mr. John Burns 533

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN EAST LONDON.—Question, Mr. Fell, Mr. Byles; Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 534

ARGENTINE TAX ON COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Kearley 535

CLIFF LADDERS FOR SHIPWRECKS.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Kearley 538

SECONDARY EDUCATION.—Mr. J. R. Macdonald; Answer, The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) 535

INCOME-TAX REFUNDS.—Question, Mr. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 536

NATIONAL PHYSICAL LABORATORY.—Question, Mr. Nield (Middlesex, Ealing); Answer, Mr. Runciman 537

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE STAFF SALARIES.—Question, Viscount Helmsley (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk); Answer, Mr. Runciman 537

Apr. 29.] Page

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR AND HIS TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. Lea, Mr. J. Ward, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs), The Treasurer of the Household (Sir Edward Strachey, Somersetshire, S.) 538

PAISLEY LICENSING CASE.—Question, Mr. Lea; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 539

FORTH FISHERIES.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 540

ILLEGITIMACY IN NORTH-WEST LANARK.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 540

SIR HORACE PLUNKETT.—Question, Mr. Lamont (Buteshire); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 540

SCOTTISH OFFICE MESSENGERSHIP.—Question, Sir S. Scott; Answer, Mr. Runciman 541

EXTRACTOR'S DEPARTMENT—CLERK'S SUPERANNUATION.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, The Lord Advocate (Mr. T. Shaw, Hawick Burghs) 541

DUBLIN TREASURY REMEMBRANCER'S CLERK.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Runciman 542

IRISH LAND STOCK INTEREST.—Questions, Mr. John Redmond (Waterford), Mr. Mooney (Newry); Answers, Mr. Runciman 542

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND AND THE ULSTER MEMBERS.—Questions, Viscount Turnour, Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.); Answers, Mr. Birrell .. 544

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL.—Question, Mr. Billson (Staffordshire, N.W.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 545

CARE OF THE FEEBLE-MINDED.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 546

SIR HORACE PLUNKETT.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 546

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale, Viscount Turnour; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 546

PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY.—Questions, Mr. Harold Cox, Viscount Helmsley; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 546

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).—Mr. STUART-WORTLEY reported from the Chairmen's Panel; That they had appointed Sir Thomas Esmonde to act as Chairman of Standing Committee A; Mr. John William Wilson to act as Chairman of Standing Committee B; Mr. Laurence Hardy to act as Chairman of Standing Committee C; and Mr. Eugene Wason to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills.

Report to lie upon the Table.

Apr. 29.] *Page*

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"

Mr Munro Ferguson (*Leith Burghs*) 547
Sir E. Tennant (*Salisbury*) 559

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'that' to the end of the Question, in order to insert the words, 'this House welcomes State action to promote small holdings; but supporting the principle of responsible ownership in land, it believes that the Government policy should be based on purchase, and deprecates the extension of an extreme form of divided ownership to districts beyond those crofter areas where the occupier provides equipment.'"—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The Solicitor-General for Scotland (*Mr. Ure, Linlithgowshire*) 560
Mr. Walter Long (*Dublin, S.*) 571
Mr. Murray (*Aberdeenshire, E.*) 571
Mr. Lambton (*Durham, S.E.*) 582
Mr. Barnes (*Blackfriars, Glasgow*) 585
Capt. Waring (*Banffshire*) 590
Sir Henry Craik (*Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*) 594

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

Worthing Gas Bill (BY ORDER.)—As amended, considered.

Mr. Ridsdale (*Brighton*) 599
Viscount Turnour (*Sussex, Horsham*) 603

Amendment proposed—

In page 25, to leave out the Schedule.—(*Mr. Ridsdale.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. Wiles (*Islington, S.*) 606
Sir Henry Kimber (*Wandsworth*) 608
Sir Alfred Hutton (*York, W.R., Morley*) 610
Mr. Nield (*Middlesex, Ealing*) 612
The Chairman of Committees (*Mr. Emmott, Oldham*) 612
Lord Edmund Talbot (*Sussex, Chichester*) 614
Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) 614

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill to be read the third time.

Apr. 30.] *Page*

Small Landholders Scotland Bill.—Postponed Proceeding on Amendment to Question [29th April], " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

" To leave out from the word ' that ' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, ' this House welcomes State action to promote small holdings ; but, supporting the principle of responsible ownership in land, it believes that the Government policy should be based on purchase, and deprecate the extension of an extreme form of divided ownership to districts beyond those crofter areas where the occupier provides equipment.' "—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)—resumed.

Question again proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 616
Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.) 624

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

Irish Tobacco Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 628

Adjourned at six minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS : TUESDAY, 30TH APRIL, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with : Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply. The same was ordered to lie on the Table 629

Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.].—The King's consent signified ; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 629

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [H.L.].— The King's consent signified ; and Bill reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 629

Kendal Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments 629

London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market) Bill.—Reported without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House To-morrow.. 629

Falmouth Gas Bill ; Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill ; Basingstoke Gas Bill.—Reported without Amendment 629

Apr. 30.] *Page*

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [H.L.]; Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill; Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [H.L.]; United Methodist Church Bill [H.L.].—Reported, with Amendments 629

Selsey Water and Gas Bill [H.L.], **now Selsey Water Bill** [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 629

Southend Water Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª and passed, and sent to the Commons .. 629

York (Micklegate) Strays Bill [H.L.].—Standing Order No. 92, considered (according to order), and dispensed with, with respect to a Petition of the Freeman of the City of York; leave given to present the said Petition .. 629

London and North Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill; North East London Railway Bill; Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill; South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners 630

Glasgow Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Renfrewshire Upper District (Eastwood and Mearns) Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection. That the Viscount Hutchinson (*E. Donoughmore*) be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Clinton; read, and agreed to 630

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [H.L.], (No. 41).—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Dorking Water, Freshwater Gas, New Tredegar Gas and Water, Skegness Gas, and Woking District Gas 630

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.], (No. 42).—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Herts and Essex Water, Mid-Kent and Twyford (Berks) Gas 630

Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [H.L.] (No. 43).—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to the rural district of Cork 630

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill [H.L.], (No. 44).—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Castleford, Egham, Formby, Grimsby (Extension), Liversedge, Maldens and Coombe, Mansfield (Extension to Mansfield Woodhouse), Paignton, Selby and Stoke-upon-Trent (Extension); And

Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.], (No. 45).—A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, the Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1890, and the Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1902, relating to the Burgh of Arbroath;

Were presensed by the Lord Granard (*E. Granard*). Read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners.. 630

Apr. 30.] *Page*

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1907.—*Precis* of Proceedings of the Colonial Conference, 15th to 26th April, 1907 631

LOAN FUND BOARD OF IRELAND.—Sixty-ninth Annual Report, 1906.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 631

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACT, 1888.—Report by the Board of Trade in accordance with Section 24, Subsection (4) of the above Act, on the schedule of maximum tolls and charges to be made applicable to the New Junction Canal, authorised by the Aire and Calder and River Dun Navigations Junction Canal Act, 1891 631

METROPOLITAN POLICE (ACCOUNTS).—Accounts showing the sums received and expended for the purposes of the Metropolitan Police and Police Pension Funds between the 1st April, 1906, and the 31st March, 1907.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 631

Irish Tobacco Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 46) 631

Destructive Insects and Pests Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee 631

Municipal Representation Bill [H.L.] [SECOND READING.]—Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Courtney of Penwith 632

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Courtney of Penwith.*)

Lord Avebury 645
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 647
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 651
Lord Ashbourne 652
The Lord Privy Seal (*The Marquess of Ripon*) 654
Lord Courtney of Penwith 656

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee.

THE COLONIAL SHIPPING CONFERENCE.

Lord Muskerry 657
The Earl of Granard 659

House adjourned at half-past Six o'clock, till to-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: TUESDAY, 30TH APRIL, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred in the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Tyne Improvement Bill [Lords.]

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time 660

Boston Spa Gas Bill; Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill; Swansea Harbour Bill.—Read a third time, and passed 661

Brighouse Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 661

London County Council (Money) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed 661

STANDING ORDERS.—Resolutions reported from the Select Committee:—

"That, in the case of the Central London Railway Bill, Petition for Additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to introduce their additional Provision if the Committee on the Bill think fit."

"That, in the case of the Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, on the condition that the name of Edward Baring be struck out of Clause 4 of the Bill, unless his consent is proved before the Committee on the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with" 661

Resolutions agreed to.

Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [LORDS].—Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill to be read a second time.—(*The Deputy Chairman*) 661

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Judicature Acts, 1873 to 1894, with respect to the persons in whom the power of making Rules of Court under those Acts is vested." [Rule Committee Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise Raymond Hill Baines to assume and bear the Christian Names of Henry Rodd in lieu of the Christian Names of Raymond Hill." [Baines' Name Bill [Lords.]

Apr. 30.] *Page*

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to alter and enlarge the provisions of the charters incorporating the Royal Bank of Scotland and of an Act Amending the same." [Royal Bank of Scotland [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to incorporate the President of and Council of King Edward's Hospital Fund for London; to provide for the management of the fund; and for other purposes," [King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill [Lords.] 661

Royal Bank of Scotland Bill [LORDS]; King Edward's Hospital Fund or London Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 662

Baines' Name Bill [LORDS].—Read the first time; to be read a second time .. 662

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Paisley, against; to lie upon the Table 662

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Musselburgh, against; to lie upon the Table 662

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions against: from Musselburgh; and, West Kilpatrick; to lie upon the Table 662

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Aberdeen; Bonnybridge; Denny and Dunnipace; Dundee; Glasgow (two); Kilmaurs; Kingston; Leith (three); Musselburgh; Portobello; and, Rutherglen; to lie upon the Table 662

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petition from Banwell, against; to lie upon the Table 662

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petitions for legislation: From Hunslet; Lichfield; Lincoln; North Bierley; Pontypridd; and, Tynemouth; to lie upon the Table 663

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Renfrewshire, against; to lie upon the Table 663

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).—Copy presented, of licence granted to Rose Smith, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Elizabeth Fry Refuge, London, E. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 663

COLONIAL CONFERENCE.—Copy presented, of *Précis* of Proceedings of the Colonial Conference, 15th to 26th April, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 663

NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT).—Copy presented, of Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1906 by the Hydrographer [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 663

Page

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Deduction from Grants to County Sligo in Respect of Land Purchase.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 663

Deduction from Grants in Respect of Land Purchase.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 665

Deduction from the Irish Land Purchase Guarantee Fund—County Cork.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 669

Evicted Tenants on the Leader Estate—Application of Mrs. Anne Connell.—Question, Mr. Sheehan (Cork County Mid.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 670

Officers Attached to the War Office.—Question, Sir H. Vincent (Sheffield, Central) ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 670

Appointment of Medical Officer at British Embassy at Tokio. — Question, Sir W. J. Collins (St. Pancras, W.) ; Answer, Sir E. Grey 671

Regular Troops Seving in India.—Question, Sir C. Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) ; Answer, Mr. Morley 672

Compulsory Reserve Funds for Limited Companies in Foreign Countries.—Question, Mr. Hyde (Wednesbury) ; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George .. 673

Trade between Great Britain and the Colonies.—Question, Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire) ; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 674

Vegetable Adulterants of Coffee.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) ; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 674

Irish Ordnance Maps—Roman Catholic Churches.—Question, Sir T. Esmonde (Wexford, N.) ; Answer, Sir E. Grey 675

Irish Banks and Land Purchase Money.—Question, Sir T. Esmonde ; Answer, Mr. Runciman 675

Case of Smallpox on H.M.S. " Defiance."—Question, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) ; Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 676

Appointments of Admiralty Messengerships. — Question, Sir S. Scott (Marylebone, W.) ; Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 676

Income Tax on Incomes Derived from a Wasting Security.—Question, Mr. Lupton ; Answer, Mr. Asquith 676

Action of Police Inspection Cruise.—Question, Mr. Flynn ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 677

Publication of the Calendar of Irish Justiciary Rolls, Statutes and Ordinances.—Question, Sir T. Esmonde ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 678

Education from Grants to Wexford County Council.—Question, Sir T. Esmonde ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 679

Apr. 30.] *Page*

Public Trustee Act—Suggested Extension to Ireland.—Question, Sir T. Esmonde; Answer, Mr. Birrell 680

Duke of York's School—Transfer of Boys to Queen Victoria Memorial School.—Question, Mr. Horniman (Chelsea); Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 680

Appointment to War Office Messengership.—Question, Sir S. Scott; Answer, Mr. Haldane 681

Norwegian Trawlers in the Moray Firth.—Question, Sir George Doughty (Great Grimsby); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 681

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Coastguard Inquiry.—Question, Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty, Mr. E. Robertson (Dundee) .. 682

The Royal Marines.—Question, Mr. G. Greenwood (Peterborough); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 682

Camp Pay for Territorial Infantry Soldiers.—Questions, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool), Sir H. Vincent (Sheffield, Central), and Sir C. Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, The Secretary of State for War, Mr. Haldane (Haddingtonshire) 683

Fleetwood Camp.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Mr. Haldane 684

General Army Staff.—Question, Mr. Stanley Wilson (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness); Answer, Mr. Haldane 685

Wages at Pimlico and Woolwich Government Factories.—Question, Mr. T. F. Richards (Wolverhampton, N.); Answer, Mr. Haldane 685

Sub-Target-Rifles.—Question, Mr. Guy Baring (Winchester); Answer, Mr. Haldane 685

Officers Attached to the War Office.—Question, Sir H. Vincent; Answer, Mr. Haldane 686

Bhagalpur District Magistrate.—Questions, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.), Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); The Under-Secretary of State for India, Mr. Hobhouse (Bristol, E.) 686

The India Budget.—Question, Mr. H. Roberts (Denbighshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Hobhouse 687

Opium Shops in India.—Question, Mr. H. Roberts; Answer, Mr. Hobhouse .. 687

Indian Excise and Customs Revenue.—Question, Mr. H. Roberts; Answer, Mr. Hobhouse 687

Chartered Company and Rhodesian Complaints.—Question, Mr. Stanger (Kensington, N.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Churchill (Manchester, N.W.) 687

Trinidad Tariff on Swedish Matches.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, Mr. Churchill 688

COOLIE RIOT AT COUVA TRINIDAD.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Mr. Churchill 688

SIR A. SWETTENHAM.—Questions, Sir G. Parker (Gravesend), Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry), Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn), Mr. Jesse Collings (Birmingham Bordesley), Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N), Mr. Pike Pease (Darlington); Answers, Mr. Churchill 689

CHINESE COOLIES IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Mr. Churchill 692

EDUCATION OF COOLIE CHILDREN IN CEYLON.—Question, Sir C. Schwann (Manchester, N.); Answer, Mr. Churchill 692

BRITISH INDIAN STOREKEEPER IN NATAL.—Question, Sir C. Schwann; Answer, Mr. Churchill 693

TURKISH CUSTOMS DUTY.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Sir E. Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 693

THE ASSOUAN DAM.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, Sir E. Grey 693

SEQUEL TO THE DENSHAWAI INCIDENT.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside); Answer, Sir E. Grey 694

EGYPTIAN DATE TREE TAX.—Questions, Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. Ashley; Answers, Sir E. Grey 695

FACTORY LEGISLATION IN EGYPT.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Sir E. Grey 695

SUNDERLAND DEATH BY BLOOD-POISONING.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 696

VACCINATION CASE AT ROMSEY.—Question, Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 696

RAILWAY RATES FOR HORTICULTURAL PRODUCE.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, The President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Lloyd-George Carnarvon Boroughs) 697

PROTECTION AGAINST THE SEA AT SPURN POINT.—Question, Mr. S. Wilson; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 697

GERMAN STEAMSHIP COMPETITION FOR AUSTRALASIAN TRADE.—Question, Sir H. Vincent; Answer, Mr. Lloyd-George 698

SMALL-POX IN GERMANY.—Question, Mr. Lupton; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. John Burns, Battersea) 699

VACCINE USED AT METZ.—Question, Mr. Lupton; Answer, Mr. John Burns .. 699

HOUSE DRAINAGE REGULATIONS IN LONDON.—Question, Mr. T. Davies (Fulham); Answer, Mr. John Burns 700

Apr. 30.]

Page

IRISH POOR LAW OFFICERS AND THE CENSUS RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Meagher (Kilkenny, N.); Answer, Mr. John Burns 700

BOURNVILLE POSTMEN SUNDAY DUTY PAY.—Question, Mr. J. F. Richards; Answer, The Postmaster General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 701

TRAINING OF STUDENTS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES.—Question, Mr. McClean (Bath); Answer The President of the Board of Education (Mr. McKenna, (Monmouthshire, N.) 701

RIFLE SHOOTING IN HARTLEPOOL SCHOOL.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Mr. McKenna 702

SCHOOL NOMENCLATURE.—Question, Mr. Clough (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton; Answer, Mr. McKenna 702

COWPER TEMPLE CLAUSE.—Question, Mr. A. Hutton (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley); Answer, Mr. McKenna 704

STATE MINERAL RIGHTS.—Question, Mr. G. Roberts (Norwich); Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 704

INCOME TAX INCIDENCE.—Question, Mr. Wiles (Islington, S.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 705

WHITBURN BEACH, SUNDERLAND.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Mr. Runciman 705

AGRICULTURAL INSTRUCTION.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.), Captain Donelan (Cork, E.); Answer, The Treasurer of the Household (Sir E. Strachey, Somerset, S.) 705

IRISH LAND PURCHASE FINANCE.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 706

CORK AND THE GUARANTEE FUND.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 707

FOREIGN TRAWLERS IN THE MORAY FIRTH.—Question, Mr. S. Wilson; Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 708

INSPECTION OF SCOTTISH DAIRIES.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow College); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 708

WEST CLARE EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Halpin (Clare, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 709

IRISH LUNACY EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Birrell 709

BALLAGHALINE PIER.—Questions, Mr. Halpin, Mr. W. Redmond (Clare, E.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 710

WANDESFORDE CASTLECOMER ESTATE.—Question, Mr. Meagher; Answer, Mr. Birrell 710

Apr. 30.] *Page*

IRISH GOVERNMENT CREDIT BALANCES.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 711

IRISH POOR LAW REFORM.—Question, Mr. Barr; Answer, Mr. Birrell 712

IRISH CIVIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Runciman 712

IRISH COURT OF JUDICATURE INVESTMENTS.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh; Answer, Mr. Runciman 713

BALLINGARRY POSTMISTRESS.—Question, Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 713

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.—Questions, Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London), Sir Howard Vincent; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 714

SCOTTISH STANDING COMMITTEE.—Questions, Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities); Answers, Mr. Speaker and Sir Brampton Gurdon (Norfolk, N.) 714

NEW BILL.

Vaccination Bill.—"To substitute a statutory declaration for the certificate required under Section 2 of the Vaccination Act, 1898, of conscientious objection," presented by Mr. John Burns; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 172] 715

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill.—Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [29th April], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House welcomes State action to promote small holdings; but, supporting the principle of responsible ownership in land, it believes that the Government policy should be based on purchase, and deprecates the extension of an extreme form of divided ownership to districts beyond those crofter areas where the occupier provides equipment' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Mr. Cochrane (Ayrshire, N.) 716
The Lord Advocate (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs) 723
Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.) 734
Mr. Erskine (Perthshire, W.) 742
Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 746
The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 762
Mr. Jesse Collings (Birmingham, Bordesley) 771
Mr. A. Dewar (Edinburgh, S.) 781
Major Anstruther-Gray (St. Andrews Burghs) 786

Page

Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton) 788
Mr. J. F. Mason (Windsor) 791
Mr. J. D. White (Dumbartonshire) 794
Colonel Kenyon-Slaney (Shropshire, Newport) 798
The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 803

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 365 ; Noes, 126. (Division List No. 149.)

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 118 ; Noes, 374. (Division List No. 150.)

Bill committed to a Standing Committee.

Adjourned at Twenty-four minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: WEDNESDAY, 1st MAY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed 821

Birmingham Corporation Water Bill. [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons 821

Colne Valley Water Bill [H.L.] ; Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Templemore be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Marquess of Zetland ; read and agreed to 821

Boston Spa Gas Bill: Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill ; Swansea Harbour Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners .. 821

Tramway Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Audenshaw Urban District Council Tramway, Huddersfield Corporation Tramway, Leeds Corporation Tramways, Taunton Tramways (Extension), and West Ham Corporation Tramways, was presented by the Lord Granard (*E. Granard*) ; read 1ª ; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 47) 821

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to Order) 821

London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market Bill).—House in Committee (according to Order): Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^{a} To-morrow 821

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT).—Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1906, by the Hydrographer 821

BOBBINITE.—Report of the Departmental Committee on Bobbinite; Minutes of Evidence 822

TRADE.—Annual statement of the trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Possessions, 1906, compared with the four preceding years: Volume I. (Summaries, abstract, and detailed tables of imports and exports).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 822

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853–1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).—Licence granted by His Majesty to Rose Smith, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Elizabeth Fry Refuge, London, E.: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 822

THE NAVY.

Earl Cawdor 822
Lord Brassey 828
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Lord Tweedmouth*) 829
Lord Ellenborough 837
Lord Leith of Fyvie 839

STANDING ORDERS OF THE HOUSE.

Earl Beauchamp 840

Moved, "To amend the reference to the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the Standing Orders of the House which relate to order in debate, and to report what alterations, if any, are desirable in those Standing Orders, by adding the following words: 'and to inquire into the practice hitherto followed in the case of Peers who may have sat and voted without taking the oath, and to report what alterations, if any, it would be desirable to make in such practice.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved, That the Lords following be namen of the Committee, viz.:—

L. Chancellor.
L. President. (*E. Crewe.*)
L. Privy Seal. (*M. Ripon.*)
D. Devonshire.
D. Rutland.
D. Northumberland.

M. Lansdowne.
E. Onslow.
E. Cawdor.
E. Camperdown.
E. Halsbury.
V. Selby.
L. Balfour.
L. Kenry. (*E. Dunraven.*)
L. Tweedmouth.
L. Newton.
L. Burghclere.

—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at a Quarter before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: WEDNESDAY, 1st MAY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

Mr. Speaker's Absence.—The House being met, the Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker, owing to indisposition.

Whereupon Mr. Emmott, the Chairman of Ways and Means, proceeded to the Table, and, after Prayers, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Message from the Lords.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Southend Waterworks Company; to extend their limits for the supply of water; to authorise the transfer to them of the water undertakings of the Urban District Council of Leigh-on-Sea and the Rural District Council of Billericay; to raise additional capital; and for other purposes." [Southend Water Bill [Lords].] 831

Southend Water Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 842

PETITIONS.

Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill.—Petition from Chudleigh, against; to lie upon the Table 842

Factory and Workshop Act (1901) Amendment Bill.—Petition from Wandsworth, against to lie upon the Table 842

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill.—Petitions in favour: from Kames; Partick; and, Stirling; to lie upon the Table 842

London Municipal Elections (Hours of Poll) Bill.—Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table 842

Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.—Petition against: from Little Grandsden; and Nuneaton; to lie upon the Table 842

Municipal Milk Depots Bill.—Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table 842

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petitions for legislation: From Bedwellty; Pembroke; and, Stepney; to lie upon the Table 842

PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICERS BILL.—Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie the Table 842

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) BILL.—Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table 842

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE (FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND BRITISH POSSESSIONS).—Copy presented, of Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Possessions for 1906. Volume I. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 843

BOBBINITE.—Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee on Bobbinite; Minutes of Evidence [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 843

MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES.—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd November, 1906; *Mr. Claude Hay*]; to lie upon the Table 843

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) [SALARIES].—Committee to consider of authorising the payment out of the Consolidated Fund, and out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of any salaries, compensation, and other expenses, that may be incurred in pursuance of any Act of the present session to encourage the formation of Small Agricultural Holdings in Scotland, and of authorising the payment of an annual grant for the purposes of such Act (King's Recommendation signified), to-morrow.—(*Mr. Whiteley*) 843

TREATMENT OF YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS (SCOTLAND).—Return ordered, "showing, for each Summary Criminal Court in Scotland, the number of Children and Young Persons under sixteen who were proceeded against for Crimes and Offences during 1906, and showing what steps were taken to deal with Children and Young Persons in Court separately from adult prisoners, in the following form, viz.—

Court.	Population of area (Census 1901.)	Total number of Children and Young Persons under 16 years proceeded against in Court.			Number of whom previously convicted.			Dealt with as under.																Whether Children or Young Persons under 16 years are dealt with in Court separately from adult prisoners; and by which method this is carried out.
								Imprisoned.		Fined.														
		M.	F.	Total.	M.	F.	Total	10 days and under.	Over 10 days.	Paid before imprisonment.	Partially paid during imprisonment.	Imprisonment in default.	Sent to Reformatory School.	Sent to Industrial School.	Whipped.	Admonished.	Caution with or without sureties (under Section 488, Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892, or at Common Law).	Placed under Probation of First Offenders Act, 1887.	Convicted and continued to a definite date for sentence or disposal (Common Law).	Charge dismissed although proved (Section 12 of Youthful Offenders Act, 1901).	Pledges, &c., forfeited.	Charge withdrawn.	Acquitted ("Not proven" or "Not guilty").	

—(*Mr. Gulland.*)

May 1.] *Page*

West Indian Sugar Trade.—Return ordered, "showing: (*a*) Production of Cane Sugar in the West India Islands and British Guiana in each of the years 1900–5, so far as this can be stated—

Colony.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Trinidad - - -						
Jamaica - - -						
&c. &c. - -						
Total - - -						

(*b*) Total exports of Cane Sugar of domestic production from the above-mentioned Colonies in each year, distinguishing exports to the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Canada—

Total exports to	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
United Kingdom - -						
United States of America						
Canada - - - -						
Other Destinations -						
Total - -						

(*c*) Changes in the Customs rates of duty imposed on Sugar in the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Canada, in the same period."—(*Sir Edward Sassoon*) 844

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Salary of Chief Medical Officer of the Post Office.—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 845

Central Telegraph Office Administration.—Question, Mr. Bowerman (Deptford); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 846

Appointments to Home Office Messengerships.—Question, Sir Samuel Scott (Marylebone, W.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 847

Sinking Fund for Redemption of Irish Land Stock.—Question, Mr. O'Mara (Kilkenny, S.); Answer, Mr. Asquith 847

Irish Intermediate Education.—Questions, Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 848

IRISH LAND COMMISSION STAFF.—Questions, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answers, Mr. Birrell 851

PROHIBITION OF MEETING OF THE UNITED IRISH LEAGUE, CLOONEY BRANCH.—Question, Mr. W. Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 853

PAYMENT OF KERRY UNION MEDICAL OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. T. O'Donnell (Kerry, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 853

SUGGESTED APPOINTMENT OF AN IRISH TRAVELLING VETERINARY INSPECTOR.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 855

SALARIES OF IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.—Question, Mr. Hugh Shaw (Donegal, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 855

IMPORTS OF CATTLE AND FRESH MEAT FROM ARGENTINA AND THE UNITED STATES.—Question, Mr. W. Ball (Hammersmith); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 857

ASSISTANT CLERKS IN THE STATISTICAL DEPARTMENT OF HIS MAJESTY'S CUSTOMS.—Question, Mr. Seaverns (Lambeth, Brixton); Answer, Mr. Runciman 858

VALUE OF FOREIGN MANUFACTURED ARTICLES FOR GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS.—Question, Mr. T. R. Bethell (Essex, Maldon); Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 858

NAVAL PENSIONS—CASE OF JOSEPH MULLEN.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 858

RICHMOND PARK—REPAIR OF ROAD FROM RICHMOND HILL TO KINGSTON GATES.—Question, Mr. Cave (Surrey, Kingston); Answer, Mr. Harcourt 859

ECCLESIASTICAL INCOME AND INCOME-TAX.—Question, Captain Balfour (Middlesex, Hornsey); Answer, Mr. Asquith 859

GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL AS REPRESENTING THE ZEMINDARS OF SIND ON THE BOMBAY COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.); Answer, Mr. Morley 859

REPORT OF THE BENARES AND BEHAR OPIUM AGENTS.—Question, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.); Answer, Mr. Morley 860

SOLDIERS AND ENFORCEMENT OF SUPPORT OF THEIR FAMILIES.—Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Haldane 860

SALARIES OF SURVEYORS FOR ENGINEER SERVICES.—Question, Mr. Cave; Answer, Mr. Haldane 861

UNREST IN EGYPT.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 861

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "ANTRIM."—Questions, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow), Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answers, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. E. Robertson, Dundee) 861

May 1.]

Page

H.M.S. "ARGYLL."—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 862

THE COASTGUARD.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 862

COASTGUARD INQUIRY.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 863

DOCKYARD STAFF.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 863

SANDHURST COLLEGE CADETS.—Question, Mr. Philip Magnus (London University); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddingtonshire) 864

BULFORD CAMP—THE SCOTS GREYS.—Question, Captain Faber; Answer, Mr. Haldane 864

ASIATICS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, Mr. Churchill 866

NEWFOUNDLAND.—Question, Mr. C. Hay; Answer, Mr. Churchill 866

NAIROBI INCIDENT.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Churchill 866

EMIGRATION TO CANADA.—Question, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood); Answer, Mr. Churchill 866

TURKISH CUSTOMS.—Question, Mr. Rees; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 867

GREAT BRITAIN AND RUSSIA AND PERSIA.—Question, Mr. C. Hay; Answer, Mr. Runciman 867

RUSSO-JAPANESE WAR—BRITISH SHIPOWNERS' CLAIMS.—Question, Mr. C. Hay; Answer, Mr. Runciman 867

SUGAR DUTIES AND THE FRUIT GROWING INDUSTRY.—Question, Mr. Scott (Ashton-under-Lyne); Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.) 868

VIVISECTION COMMISSION REPORTS.—Question, Sir Philip Magnus; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.) 868

FEMALE FACTORY WORKERS IN BELFAST.—Question, Mr. J. Devlin (Belfast, W.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 868

REGISTERED PACKET REGULATIONS.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 869

ILLEGAL TRAWLING IN DUNNET BAY, CAITHNESS.—Question, Mr. R. L. Harmsworth (Caithness); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 869

Irish Land Purchase—Fair Rents.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.); Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 870

Killna Castle Estate, Westmeath.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 870

Estates Commissioners' Annual Reports.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 871

Sligo Lunatic Asylum—Evicted Tenants as Pauper Lunatics.—Question, Mr. P. A. McHugh (Sligo, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 871

Mr. G. B. Low's Grenagh Estate.—Question, Mr. Crean (Cork, S.E.); Answer Mr. Birrell 872

Elphin Demonstration.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.), Captain Dolan (Cork, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 873

Intimidatory Procession in Roscommon.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 874

Ballintubber Demonstration.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.), Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.), Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.) and Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 875

Irish Land Finance.—Questions, Captain Craig (Down, E.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 876

Evicted Tenants—Delays in Settling Claims.—Questions, Mr. Flynn; Answers, Mr. Birrell 876

Mr. Blennerhasset's Killorglin Estate.—Questions, Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.) and Mr. T. O'Donnell, (Kerry, W.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 877

Irish National School Buildings.—Question, Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 878

Drimoleague Dispensary Doctor.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale; Answer, Mr. Birrell 879

Sacred Society of Clooney.—Question, Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham); Answer, Mr. Birrell 879

Alleged Moonlighting in Galway.—Questions, Sir B. Sheffield (Lincolnshire, Brigg), Captain Donelan (Cork, E.), Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.), and Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 880

Lisevine Evicted Tenant.—Question, Mr. Crean; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 881

Mr. M. F. Barry's Cooldoriy Tenantry.—Question, Mr. Crean; Answer, Mr. Birrell 882

Gargrie Labourer's Cottage.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 883

Dring Evicted Tenant.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 883

May 1.]

Page

GRANARD COUNCIL AND THE IRISH PIG TRADE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 884

MACONCHY ESTATE TURBARY TRUSTEE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 884

LONGFORD ESTATE DUTY GRANT.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell; Answer, Mr. Birrell 884

IRISH LANGUAGE IN IRISH SCHOOLS.—Questions, Mr. T. O'Donnell and Captain Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell 885

KILLARNEY AFFRAY.—Questions, Mr. Lonsdale, Sir B. Sheffield, and Mr. Flynn; Answers, Mr. Birrell 885

IRISH INTERMEDIARY SCHOOLS.—Questions, Mr. Gwynn (Galway), Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.); Answers, Mr. Birrell 886

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Question, Mr. W. Long (Dublin, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 887

CARRICK-ON-SHANNON DISTURBANCE.—Question, Mr. J. O'Kelly (Roscommon, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 887

KING-HARMAN ESTATE.—Question, Mr. J. O'Kelly; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 888

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION IN IRELAND.—Question, Mr. Kettle; Answer, Mr. Birrell 889

IRISH EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Hayden; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 889

SLIGO GRANT DEDUCTION.—Questions, Mr. P. A. McHugh, Mr. Joyce (Limerick); Answer, Mr. Birrell 890

NORTH BELFAST ELECTION.—Question, Mr. J. Devlin; Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) 891

IRISH UNECONOMIC HOLDINGS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Runciman 892

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH AND HIS TENANTS.—Questions, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.), Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs), Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.), Mr. Walter Long, Captain Faber and Mr. Flavin; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) 892

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.—Questions, Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) and Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 895

VISCOUNT TURNOUR AND MR. BIRRELL'S SPEECH AT HALIFAX.

Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham) 896
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 898

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—SIR WILLIAM GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection: That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A: Mr. Beauchamp (added in respect of the

May 1.] *Page*

Advertisements Regulation Bill); and had appointed, in substitution, Mr. Gooch (in respect of the Advertisements Regulation Bill).

Sir William Gurdon further reported from the Committee: That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill): Mr. Ainsworth and Mr. Whitehead; and had appointed, in substitution, Mr. Radford and Sir Frederick Cawley. Reports to lie upon the Table 899

House of Commons (Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms). -First Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 135] 900

Business of the House (Ways and Means).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the proceedings on Report of the Committee of Ways and Means, if under discussion when the Business is postponed this day, be resumed and proceeded with, though opposed, after the interruption of Business."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman*).

The House divided :—Ayes, 305; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 151) .. 900

Ways and Means [18th April] Report.

Resolutions reported.

Tea.

1. "That the Customs duty now charged on tea shall continue to be charged until the first day of July, nineteen hundred and eight (that is to say)— Tea, the pound, fivepence."

Continuance of Additional Customs Duties on Tobacco, Beer, and Spirits.

2. "That the additional Customs duties on tobacco, beer, and spirits imposed by Sections two, three, four, and five of the Finance Act, 1900 (including any increased duties imposed by Section five of that Act), shall continue to be charged until Parliament otherwise determine."

Continuance of Additional Excise Duties on Beer and Spirits.

3. "That the additional Excise duties on beer and spirits imposed by Sections six and seven of the Finance Act, 1900, shall continue to be charged until Parliament otherwise determine."

Hire-purchase Agreement.

2. "That a hire-purchase agreement shall be charged with stamp duty as an agreement, or, if under seal, or in Scotland, with a clause of registration as a deed, as the case requires, and shall not in any case be exempt from stamp duty as an agreement, letter, or memorandum made for or relating to the sale of any goods, wares, or merchandise."

Estate Duty (Finance Act, 1896, s. 21).

5. "That the deduction allowed under Section twenty-one of the Finance Act, 1896, on account of the previous payment of duty on property, shall (instead of being calculated as provided by that section) be taken to be the amount which would be payable on account of the duty on the property if the duty were calculated on the value of the property upon which estate duty is payable."

May 1.] *Page*

PERMANENT ANNUAL CHARGE.

6. "That the permanent annual charge for the National Debt for the current financial year be twenty-nine and a half million pounds."

MENDMENT OF LAW.

7. "That it is expedient to amend the law relating to the National Debt, Customs, and Inland Revenue."

First Resolution read a second time.

Mr. Fletcher (Hampstead) .. 904
Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye) .. 905

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'Five,' and insert the word 'Four.'"—(*Mr. Fletcher.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Five,' stand part of the said Resolution."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.) .. 906
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (Worcestershire, E.) .. 907
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) .. 909
Sir F. Banbury (City of London) .. 910
Mr. J. F. Mason (Windsor) .. 911
Captain Craig (Down, E.) .. 912
Mr. Alexander Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie) .. 913
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) .. 915
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) .. 916
Sir Edward Sassoon (Hythe) .. 918
Sir C. Schwann (Manchester, N.) .. 920
Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend) .. 921
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone) .. 923
Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central) .. 924
Mr. Hicks Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) .. 925
Mr. F. E. Smith (Liverpool, Walton) .. 926

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 250 ; Noes, 146. (Division List No. 152.)

Resolution agreed to.

Second Resolution read a second time.

Mr. Harmood-Banner (Liverpool, Everton) .. 931
Sir F. Banbury .. 932

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'Parliament otherwise determine,' and insert the words 'the first day of July, nineteen hundred and eight.'"—(*Mr. Harmood-Banner.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the said Resolution."

Mr. Asquith .. 933
Mr. Austen Chamberlain .. 935
Mr. Rawlinson (Cambridge University) .. 936
Colonel Lockwood (Essex, Epping) .. 936
Mr. Alexander Cross .. 937
Mr. Asquith .. 938
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) .. 938
Mr. Leif Jones (Westmoreland, Appleby) .. 939
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) .. 940
Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) .. 940
Mr. *William Redmond (Clare, E.)* .. 941

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 257 ; Noes, 122. (Division List No. 153.)

Resolution agreed to.

Third Resolution read a second time.

Mr. Alexander Cross .. 945

Resolution agreed to.

Fourth Resolution read a second time.

Sir F. Banbury .. 945
Mr. Asquith .. 946

Resolution agreed to.

Fifth Resolution read a second time.

Mr. Asquith .. 947
Mr. Courthope .. 947

Resolution agreed to.

Sixth Resolution read a second time.

Sir F. Banbury .. 949
Captain Craig .. 950

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out the words ' for the current financial year.' "—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, " That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the said Resolution."

Mr. Asquith .. 951

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 291 ; Noes, 57. (Division List No. 154.)

Mr. Asquith .. 955
Mr. Austin Chamberlain .. 955

May 1.] *Page*

Resolution agreed to.

Seventh Resolution agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS [24TH APRIL] REPORT.

Resolutions reported :

INCOME TAX.

1. " That the income-tax shall be charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, at the rate of one shilling in the pound."

ESTATE DUTY.

2. " That in the case of persons dying on or after the nineteenth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, the rates of estate duty under section seventeen of The Finance Act, 1894, be amended so that—

Where the Principal Value of the Estate			Estate Duty shall be payable at the rate per cent. of	Instead of
Exceeds— £		£		
150,000	and does not exceed	250,000	Seven pounds - - -	Six pounds ten shillings
250,000	,, ,,	500,000	Eight pounds - - -	Seven pounds
500,000	,, ,,	750,000	Nine pounds - - -	Seven pounds ten shillings
750,000	,, ,,	1,000,000	Ten pounds - - -	Seven pounds ten shillings
1,000,000	,, ,,	1,500,000	Ten pounds on one million and eleven pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
1,500,000	,, ,,	2,000,000	Ten pounds on one million and twelve pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
2,000,000	,, ,,	2,500,000	Ten pounds on one million and thirteen pounds on remainder	Eight pounds
2,500,000	,, ,,	3,000,000	Ten pounds on one million and fourteen pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
3,000,000	-		Ten pounds on one million and fifteen pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds

INCOME TAX (INCLUSION OF ALL OFFICES AND EMPLOYMENTS IN SCHEDULE E).

3. "That the income-tax charged on offices or employments of profit, whether public or not, be charged under Schedule E. in the Income Tax Act, 1853."

INCOME-TAX (LIMITATION ON THE AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF DEDUCTIONS OR REPAYMENTS FOR WEAR AND TEAR).

4 "That no deduction or repayment be allowed in any year in respect of the diminished value, by reason of wear and tear, of any machinery or plant which, when added to the deductions or repayments allowed on that account in previous years, will make the aggregate amount of the deductions or repayments exceed the actual cost of the machinery or plant."

INCOME-TAX (ABOLITION OF REPAYMENTS IN RESPECT OF ASSESSMENT ON AVERAGE INCOME).

5. "That any abatement, relief, or repayment of income-tax under Section one hundred and thirty-three of The Income-Tax Act, 1842, as amended by Section six of The Revenue Act, 1865, shall cease."

INCOME-TAX (ASSESSMENT ON TRADES, ETC., RECENTLY COMMENCED).

6. "That income-tax charged under Schedule D in the Income-Tax Act, 1853, on professions, trades, or vocations shall, in the case of professions, trades, or vocations which have been set up or commenced within the three years on which the average income is to be computed under the Income-Tax Acts or within the year of assessment, be charged with reference to the actual profits or gains arising in the year of assessment."

First Resolution read a second time.

Mr. Samuel Roberts (*Sheffield, Ecclesall*) 959

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, Further Proceeding was postponed without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 4.

FAILURE OF SHOP HOURS ACT.

Mr. Shackleton (*Lancashire, Clitheroe*) 960
Mr. Seddon (*Lancashire, Newton*) 964

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That in the opinion of this House, more drastic legislation with regard to the closing of shops and the hours of shop assistants is required."—(*Mr. Shackleton.*)

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, Central*) 968
Sir Charles Dilke (*Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean*) 972
Mr. A. C. Corbett (*Glasgow, Tradeston*) 973
Mr. T. Davies (*Fulham*) 974
Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) 974
Mr. J. D. White (*Dumbartonshire*) 977

May 1.] Page

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, more drastic legislation with regard to the Closing of Shops and the Hours of Shop Assistants is required.—(*Mr. Shackleton*).

TOWN DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. P. W. Wilson (*St. Pancras, S.*) 978
Mr. Jowett (*Bradford, W.*) 982

Motion made and Question proposed—" That in the opinion of this House, local authorities should be granted by legislation the power of laying out suburbs for building upon a rational plan, which shall include adequate air space, convenient grounds for recreation, and facilities for locomotion, so preventing the grave evils which result from overcrowding in and around great cities."—(*Mr. P. W. Wilson.*)

Viscount Turnour (*Sussex, Horsham*) 986
The President of the Local Government Board (*Mr. John Burns, Battersea*) 987

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, local authorities should be granted by legislation the power of laying out suburbs for building upon a rational plan, which shall include adequate air-space, convenient grounds for recreation, and facilities for locomotion, so preventing the grave evils which result from overcrowding in and around great cities.—(*Mr. P. W. Wilson.*)

NEW BILLS.

INCEST.—Bill to provide for the punishment of Incest, ordered to be brought in by Colonel Lockwood, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Crossley, Mr. Henry Joseph Wilson, Mr. Goddard Clarke, Mr. Maclean, Mr. John Wilson, and Mr. George Hardy.

Incest Bill.—" To provide for the punishment of Incest," presented accordingly, and read the first time ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 173] 991

WAYS AND MEANS [24TH APRIL] REPORT.

Postponed Proceeding on Consideration of First Resolution, reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, " That Income-tax shall be charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, at the rate of one shilling in the pound," resumed.

Motion made, and Question, " That further Consideration of the said Resolution be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be further considered upon Monday next.

Subsequent Resolutions to be considered upon Monday next.

Bill ordered, upon the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means of the 18th April and agreed to this day, to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Sydney Buxton, Mr. McKenna, and Mr. Runciman 991

Adjourned at a quarter after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS: THURSDAY, 2ND MAY, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Canal Tolls and Charges (New Junction Canal) Order Confirmation [H.L.].

The same was ordered to lie on the Table 993

PASLEY CHILDREN LEGITIMISATION.—Petition of Thomas Hamilton Sabine Pasley, residing at Northlands, Cowes, in the Isle of Wight, praying for leave to introduce a Bill to declare legitimate certain children of Thomas Hamilton Sabine Pasley, together with a copy of the proposed Bill annexed there to; read, and referred to the Examiners 993

MURPHY GRIMSHAW'S DIVORCE (VALIDATION).—Petition of William Howard Murphy Grimshaw, of 109, Cromwell Road, South Kensington, in the county of London, praying for leave to present a Bill to remove doubts as to the validity of a certain Decree, dated 30th October, 1893, of the High Court of Justice (Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division) dissolving the marriage solemnised on the 16th November, 1880, between William Howard Murphy Grimshaw and Mary Evalina Julia Murphy Grimshaw, then Mary Evalina Julia Woodward, spinster, and to confirm the said Decree, was presented, and read: Ordered that the said petition be taken into consideration on Monday the 13th instant and that notice thereof be given to the said Mary Evalina Julia Murphy Grimshaw: Leave given to the Petitioner and to the said Evalina Julia Murphy Grimshaw to be heard by Counsel at the Bar upon the said petition 993

Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 993

Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments 994

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee continued sitting this day in the absence of the Marquess of Zetland; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 994

Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill.—Read 2^{a}, and committed .. 994

Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill; Basingstoke Gas Bill.—Read 3^{a}, and passed 994

May 2.]

Page

Buckhaven Dock Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, that it is not expedient to proceed further with the Bill; read, and ordered to lie on the Table 994

Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord de Mauley be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Teynham; read, and agreed to 994

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [H.L.].—The Order made on the 25th of April last, appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bill, discharged 994

Worthing Gas Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1a; and referred to the Examiners 994

London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market) Bill.—Read 3a (according to order), and passed 994

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ALLOTMENTS AND SMALL HOLDINGS.—Memorandum of evidence contained in Parliamentary Papers as to the demand for allotments and small holdings and as to the difficulty of obtaining land for those purposes 994

TREATY SERIES, No. 12 (1907).—Exchange of notes between United Kingdom and Germany respecting the estates of deceased seamen, 16th February—21st March, 1907 995

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.
No. 3770. Saxony (Chemnitz).
No. 3771. Turkey (Palestine).
No. 3772. Venezuela (Caracas) 995

ARTERIAL DRAINAGE (IRELAND).—Appendix to the Report of the Viceregal Commission on Arterial Drainage (Ireland).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 995

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (CITY OF MANCHESTER.)—Order made by the Council of the City of Manchester, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within a certain part of the city; laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 995

NEW BILLS.

Factory and Workshop Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to amend the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, with respect to laundries, and to extend that Act to certain institutions, and to provide for the inspection of certain premises—Was presented by the Earl Beauchamp; read 1a; to be printed; and to be read 2a on Tuesday the 14th instant. (No. 48) 995

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for

Page

Ireland relating to the rural district of Ballycastle, the Bangor and Newtonards Joint Hospital, County Down, and the urban district of Dalkey. Was presented by the Lord Denham; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 49) 995

SMALL HOLDINGS.

The Marquess of Lansdowne 995
The President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries (*Earl Carrington*) 996

Companies Bill [H.L.].—House in Committee (according to Order).

[The EARL of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3:—

Viscount Ridley 996

Amendment moved—

"In page 4, line 32, to leave out the word 'five' and to insert the word 'fifty.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

Lord Avebury 996
The Earl of Granard 997

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 3 agreed to

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clause 5:—

Viscount Ridley 997

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6:—

The Earl of Granard 997

Amendments moved—

"In page 5, line 14, to leave out the words 'a contract which under' and to insert the words 'such a contract as is mentioned in'; in lines 15 and 16 to leave out the words 'is required to be filed with the registrar'; in lines 16 and 17 to leave out the words 'it shall be a sufficient compliance with that paragraph if the company' and to insert the words 'the company shall'; in line 21, after the word 'writing' to insert as new subsections:

Page

"(2) Such particulars shall be deemed to be an instrument within the meaning of the Stamp Act, 1891, and the registrar may, as a condition of filing the particulars, require that the duty payable thereon be adjudicated under section twelve of that Act.

"(3) The provisions of section seven of the Companies Act, 1900, imposing penalties for default, shall apply as if the requirements of this section were a requirement contained in that section."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7:—

Viscount Ridley 998

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 26, after the word 'may' to insert the words 'with the sanction of a special resolution of the company, passed and duly confirmed in manner hereinafter mentioned, and should such a course be desired by not less than 10 per cent. in amount of the shareholders with the subsequent approval of the court.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

The Earl of Granard 999
Lord Leith of Fyvie 999
Lord Faber 1000
The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 1000
The Marquess of Lansdowne 1000

On Question, Amendment as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 8 and 9 agreed to.

Clause 10:—

The Earl of Granard 1001

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 12, after the word 'relate' to insert as a new sub-section '(2) Nothing in this section shall affect any company to which the Indian Railway Company's Act, 1894, as amended by any subsequent enactment, applies.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 10, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 11:—

The Earl of Granard 1001

Page

Amendment moved—

"In page 8, to leave out lines 2 to 5."—(*The Earl of Granard.*

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Granard 1002

Amendment moved—

"In page 10, line 24, after the word 'sufficient' to insert as a new sub-section '(9) Where a debenture containing or giving by reference to a deed containing a charge required to be registered under this section is renewed by extending the currency thereof beyond the date originally fixed, such renewal shall require to be registered under this section as if it were a fresh charge.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 11, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 12 to 15 agreed to.

Clause 16 :—

Viscount Ridley 1002

Amendment moved—

"In page 11, line 37, after the word 'company' to insert the words 'with the sanction of an extraordinary resolution of the company.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

The Earl of Granard 1003
Lord Avebury 1003
Viscount Ridley 1003

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 16 agreed to

Clauses 17 to 19 agreed to.

Clause 20 :—

Viscount Ridley 1003

Amendment moved—

"In page 13, line 19, to leave out the word 'two' and to insert the word 'twenty.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

The Earl of Granard 1004

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

May 2.] Page

Clause 20, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 21:—

Lord Avebury 1004

Amendment moved—

"In page 13, line 32, after the word 'auditors' to insert the words 'one at least of whom, in the case of every company whose authorised capital amounts to fifty thousand pounds, shall be a professional accountant.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

Lord Faber 1005

The Earl of Granard 1005

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In page 13, line 32, after the word 'auditors,' to insert the words 'one at least of the auditors shall be a person who publicly carries on business as an accountant.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

Lord Ashbourne 1006
The Lord Chancellor 1006
The Earl of Galloway 1006

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Avebury 1006

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 5, at the beginning of Sub-section (3), to insert the words "The balance-sheet shall be signed by two of the directors of the company and.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Avebury 1007

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, lines 14 and 15, to leave out the words 'and by the company to every shareholder not less than seven days.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

Lord Faber 1008
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1008
The Earl of Granard 1008
Lord Avebury 1008
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1009
Lord Avebury 1009

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

Lord Avebury 1009

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 22, after the word 'pounds' to insert the following new sub-section: '(6) Where in any prospectus issued by a company any person is named as the auditor the said person shall, unless he resign the appointment, continue to be the auditor of the said company until the first annual general meeting succeeding the issue thereof."—(*Lord Avebury.*)

The Earl of Granard 1010
Lord Ashbourne 1010
The Lord Chancellor 1010

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 21, as amended, agreed to.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1010

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 21, to insert the following new clause:—

'In the case of companies registered in Scotland the Summary mentioned in Section 26 of the Companies Act, 1862, in addition to the particulars required to be specified by that section and by Section 19 of the Companies Act, 1900, shall also specify the total amount of debt due from the company in respect of all mortgages and charges.'"
—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

The Earl of Granard 1011

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 22:—

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 25, to leave out the words 'annually forward to the registrar with' and to insert the words 'include in.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1012
The Lord Chancellor 1012
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1012

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Avebury 1012

May 2.]

Page

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 26, to leave out the words 'of its affairs.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1013

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 32, after the word 'loss' to insert the words 'this section shall not apply to a private company unless such company has created a mortgage or charge as defined by subsection one of section eleven of this Act.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

The Earl of Granard 1013
Lord Faber 1013
The Lord Chancellor 1014
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1015

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 22, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 23 and 24 agreed to.

Clause 25 :—

Viscount Ridley 1015

Amendment moved—

"In page 15, line 23, after the word 'pounds' to insert the words 'per day for every day in default.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

Lord Avebury 1016
Viscount Ridley 1016
The Lord Chancellor 1016

On Question, Amendment negatived.

Viscount Ridley 1016

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a new Subsection : '(2) At least twenty-one days notice exclusive of the date by which proxies must be lodged must be given of all meetings of every company.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1017
Lord Faber 1017

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 25, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 15, line 25, after the word 'company' to insert the words 'or direct the suspension of any meeting.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

Lord Faber 1018
The Earl of Granard 1018

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 26, agreed to.

Clause 27 :—

Viscount Ridley 1018

Amendment moved—

"In page 15, line 26, after the word 'demanded' to insert the words 'on any resolution whether for adjournment or otherwise.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

The Lord Chancellor 1019
Viscount Ridley 1019

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Clause 27, as amended, agreed to.

Viscount Ridley 1019

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 27, to insert the following new clause, 'The following section shall be substituted for Section 51 of the Companies Act, 1862: A resolution passed by the company under this Act shall be deemed to be special whenever a resolution has been passed by a majority of not less than three-fourths of such members of the company for the time being entitled, according to the regulations of the company, to vote, as may be present in person or by proxy (in cases where, by the regulations of the company, proxies are allowed) at any general meeting at which notice specifying the intention to propose such resolution has been duly given and such resolution has been confirmed by a like majority of such members for the time being entitled according to the regulations of the company, to vote, as may be present in person or by proxy at a subsequent meeting of which notice has been duly given, and held at an interval of not less than fourteen days nor more than one month from the date of the meeting at which such resolution was first passed. At any meeting mentioned in this section, unless a poll is demanded by at least five members, a declaration of the chairman that the resolution has been carried shall be deemed conclusive evidence of the fact, without proof of the number or proportion of the votes recorded in favour of or against the same. In computing

May 2.] Page

the majority under this section when a poll is demanded, reference shall be had to the number of votes to which each member is entitled by the regulations of the company.' "—(*Viscount Ridley*)

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1020
Viscount Ridley 1021
Lord Avebury 1021
The Earl of Granard 1021

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clauses 28 to 31 agreed to.

Clause 32 :—

The Earl of Granard 1021

Amendment moved—

" In page 17, line 5, after the word ' dissolved ' to insert as a new sub-section : ' (3) It shall be the duty of the person on whose application the order was made, within seven days after the making of the order, to file with the registrar an office copy of the order, and if such person fails to do so he shall be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding five pounds for every day during which the default continues.' "—(*The Earl of Granard*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 32, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 33 and 34 agreed to.

Clause 35 :—

The Earl of Granard 1022

Amendment moved—

" In page 17, line 33, to leave out from the word ' person ' to the end of the clause, and to insert the words ' acts as a director of the company he shall be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding five pounds for every day between the expiration of the said period or shorter time and hte last day on which it is proved that he acted as a director.' "—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 35, as amended, agreed to.

Viscount Ridley 1022

Amendment moved—

" After Clause 35, to insert the following new clause, ' No director may vote or take part in any matter or dealing of any kind soever

with or affecting any other business or company in which he is interested or concerned unless the fullest disclosure is made in writing of his interest or connection.' "—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

The Lord Chancellor 1023

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 36 agreed to.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1023

Amendment moved—

> " After Clause 36, to insert the following new clause, ' Notwithstanding anything contained in the statute of the Scots Parliament of 1696, cap. 25, debentures to bearer issued in Scotland are declared to be valid and binding according to their terms.' "—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 37 :—

The Earl of Granard 1023

Amendment moved—

> " In page 19, line 25, after the word ' debentures,' to insert the words ' together with such a statement as the company if a public company would, under the provisions of Section 6 of the Companies Act, 1900, have had to file before commencing business.' "—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 37, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 38 agreed to.

Clause 39—

The Earl of Granard 1023

Amendment moved—

> " In page 20, line 5, after the word ' classes,' to insert the words ' but provided always that no preference or special privilege attached to or belonging to any class of shares shall be interfered with except by a special resolution passed and confirmed by shareholders of that class independently of the presence or votes of any shareholders of any other class, and every resolution so passed shall be a valid special resolution, binding all shareholders of such class.' "—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Amendment moved—

"In page 20, line 5, after the word 'classes' to insert as a new subsection: '(2) Where an order is made under this section an office copy thereof shall be filed with the registrar within seven days after the making of the order, and if default is made in compliance with this provision the company, and every director, manager, secretary, or other officer of the company who is knowingly a party to the default, shall on conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding five pounds for every day during which the default continues.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 39, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 40 agreed to.

Clause 41 :—

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

The Earl of Granard 1025

Amendment moved—

"In page 20, line 17, after the word 'relates' to insert the words 'and shall also, on ceasing to act as such receiver or manager, file with the registrar notice to that effect, which notice shall be entered by the registrar on the register of mortgages and charges."'—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to

Clause 41, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 42 :—

Lord Barnard 1025

Amendment moved—

"In page 20, line 23, after the word 'may' to insert the words 'if the Board is satisfied that the conditions and regulations under which such licence was granted or is held have not been observed.'"—(*Lord Barnard*).

The Lord Chancellor 1027
The Lord Bishop of Salisbury 1027
The Lord Chancellor 1028

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Amendment moved —

"In page 20, line 27, after the word 'section' to insert the words, 'Before any such licence is revoked under this section the Board of

Trade shall give notice in writing of their intention to the company and shall afford the company an apportunity of being heard in opposition to such revocation.' "—(*Lord Barnard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 42, as amended, agreed to.

Amendment moved—

" After Clause 42, to insert the following new clause: " For removing doubts it is hereby declared that the Commonwealth of Australia is a colony within the meaning of the Companies (Colonial Registers) Act, 1883.' "—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Viscount Ridley 1029

Amendment moved—

" After Clause 42, to insert the following new clause: ' Section fifty-six, subsection two, of the Companies Act, 1862, shall be read and construed as if the words therein " one-fifth part " had been " one-tenth part.' "—(*Viscount Ridley*).

The Lord Chancellor 1029

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 43 and 44 agreed to.

Viscount Ridley 1029

Amendment moved—

" After Clause 44, to insert the following new clause: " Any condition requiring or binding any shareholder to waive compliance with any of the requirements of this Act shall be void.' "—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

The Earl of Granard 1030
The Lord Chancellor 1030

Amendment, by leave of the House withdrawn.

Clause 45 agreed to.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1031

Amendment moved—

" After Clause 45, to insert the following new clause: " In the application of this Act to Scotland. (1) " Solicitor of the High Court " shall mean enrolled law agent; (2) Where the words " Board of Trade " occur in Section 10 (2) and (3) the words " Accountant of

Court" shall be read in lieu thereof; (3) The provisions of this Act with respect to the registration of mortgages and charges shall not apply to companies registered in Scotland; (4) Section 41 shall not apply to Scotland; (5) All prosecutions for offences or fines shall be at the instance of the Lord Advocate or a Procurator Fiscal as the Lord Advocate may direct.' "—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

The Lord Chancellor 1032

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clause agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived. The Report of Amendments to be received on Tuesday, the 14th instant; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 50.)

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: THURSDAY, 2ND MAY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the Borough of Tower Hamlets (Stepney Division), in the room of Sir William Eden Evans-Gordon (Chiltern Hundreds):—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood*) 1033

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Worthing Gas Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1033

Bristol Corporation Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1033

Great Central Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1033

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 5.)—Sir LEWIS McIVER reported from the Committee on Group 5 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at half-past Eleven of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 1033

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 2).—Mr. SOAMES reported from the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at Two of the Clock.

Report to lie upon the Table 1033

May 2.] *Page*

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.—That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for amending certain provisions of the Birmingham Corporation Water Acts in regard to repayment of moneys borrowed for the purpose of those Acts, and for other purposes." Birmingham Corporation Water Bill [Lords] .. 1033

Birmingham Corporation Water Bill (LORDS).—Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills 1034

PETITIONS.

BUTTER AND MARGARINE BILL.—Petition of the Royal Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1034

EDUCATION ACTS (AMENDMENT) BILL.—Petition of the Royal Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1034

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION BILL.—Petition of the Royal Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1034

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Anniesland and Jordanhill; Breadalbane; Camelon; Glasgow; Partick; and Whiteinch; to lie upon the Table 1034

PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.—Petition of the Royal Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1034

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) BILL.—Petition of the Royal Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1034

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.—Petition from Kidderminster, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table 1034

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES.—Return [presented 1st May] to be printed. [No. 136.] 1034

ARTERIAL DRAINAGE COMMISSION (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Appendix to the Report of the Viceregal Commission on Arterial Drainage in Ireland, with Minutes of Proceedings, Evidence, and Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. 1035

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.—Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the City of Manchester and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within a certain part of the City [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1035

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series. Nos. 3770 to 3772 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1035

TREATY SERIES (No. 12, 1907).—Copy presented, of Exchange of Notes between the United Kingdom and Germany, respecting the Estates of Deceased Seamen, 16th February, 21st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1035

May 2.]

Page

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (CLOSING ORDERS).—Address for "Return showing separately for England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, to the 31st day of March, 1907, the number of Closing Orders made by local authorities under the Shop Hours Act, 1904, and submitted to the central authority for confirmation; the number of such Orders confirmed, (a) with amendments, and (b) without amendments; and the number of such Orders subsequently revoked upon application of the local authority."—(*Mr. Crooks*) 1035

EAST INDIA FINANCIAL STATEMENT.—Address for "Return of the Indian Financial Statement for 1907–8 and of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council of the Governor-General thereon."—(*Sir Henry Fowler.*) 1035

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE (ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND).—Return ordered, "showing, for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, the amount contributed by England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively, to the Revenue collected by Imperial officers; the Expenditure on English, Scottish, and Irish Services met out of such Revenue, and the balances of Revenue contributed by England, Scotland, and Ireland, respectively, which are available for Imperial Expenditure (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 278, of Session 1906."—(*Mr. John O'Connor.*) 1036

HARBOUR, &c., BILLS (BURNHAM (SOMERSET) PIER BILL).—Copy ordered, of the Report of the Board of Trade on the Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill." —(*Mr. Lloyd-George*) 1036

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

PORTSMOUTH DOCKYARD LABOURERS' PAY.—Question, Mr. Bramsdon (Portsmouth); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1036

KEYHAM AND DEVONPORT BRICKLAYERS' PAY.—Question, Sir John Benn (Devonport); Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1036

ROCKCHAPEL MAILS.—Question, Mr. Flynn (Cork, N.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1037

POST OFFICE ANNUITANTS.—Question, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1037

CROUCH END TELEPHONE EXCHANGE.—Question, Captain Balfour (Middlesex, Hornsey); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1038

BOARD OF TRADE AND THE RAILWAY COMPANIES.—Question, Mr. Hooper, (Dudley); Answer, Mr. Kearley 1038

LONDON MOTOR OMNIBUSES.—Question, Mr. Claude Hay (Shoreditch, Hoxton); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1039

KILINDINI HARBOUR, EAST AFRICA.—Question, Sir C. Hill (Shrewsbury); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1039

GAME PROTECTION IN EAST AFRICA AND UGANDA.—Question, Sir C. Hill; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1039

LAND ACT GUARANTEE FUND.—Question, Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.) Answer, Mr. Runciman 1040

LAND ACT TREASURY RULES.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1042

May 2.] Page

LAND ACT STOCK.—Question, Mr. J. O'Connor (Kildare, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1043

IRISH DEVELOPMENT GRANT AND IRISH LAND PURCHASE.—Question, Mr. Mooney (Newry); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1043

SCOTTISH SMALL HOLDINGS.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Sinclair .. 1044

HORSE BREEDING IN SCOTLAND.—Question, Mr. A. Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1044

CAMBRIDGE COTTAGE, KEW.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Sir E. Strachey 1045

KEW GARDENS GUIDE.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Sir E. Strachey .. 1045

ROBERTSTOWN MAIL SERVICE.—Question, Mr. J. O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1046

MOTHERWELL LICENSING CASE.—Question, Mr. Findlay (Lanarkshire, N. E.); Answer, Mr. T. Shaw 1046

BOARDS OF GUARDIANS AND WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION RULE.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Mr. J. Burns 1047

IPSWICH UNION LABOUR YARD.—Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Mr. J. Burns 1047

NEWARK GUARDIANS RELIEF WORK PAY —Question, Mr. Summerbell; Answer, Mr. J. Burns 1047

GOVERNMENT LUNACY GRANT.—Question, Mr. W. Pearce (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse); Answer, Mr. J. Burns 1049

PROBATE AND ESTATE DUTY VALUATIONS.—Question, Mr Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Asquith 1049

IRISH COUNTY COUNCIL BANK ACCOUNTS.—Question, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1050

IRISH LAW OFFICERS' FEES.—Question, Mr. Ginnell; Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1050

KILTYCLOGHER EVICTED TENANT.—Question, Mr. Dolan (Leitrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1051

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

OBSOLETE WARSHIPS.—Question, Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College); Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. E. Robertson, Dundee) 1051

MARINE OFFICERS.—Question, Mr. G. Greenwood (Peterborough); Answer, Mr. Robertson 1052

ROSYTH.—Questions, Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central), Mr. Watt, Sir G. Parker (Gravesend), Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis), Major A. Gray (St. Andrews Burghs) Mr. Morton (Sutherland) Mr. A. Cross (Glasgow, Camlachie); Answer, Mr. E. Robertson 1052

May 2.]

Page

GARRISON ARTILLERY MILITIA.—Question, Mr. Fell (Great Yarmouth); Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 1054

TERRITORIAL FORCE—COUNTY ASSOCIATION FUNDS.—Question, Sir C. Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean ;) Answer, Mr. Haldane 1054

THE INDIAN BUDGET.—Question, Mr. Ellis (Nottinghamshire. Rushcliffe; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for India (Mr. C. Hobhouse, Bristol, E.) 1055

ASSAM CHILDREN'S EDUCATION.—Question, Mr. H. Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury); Answer, Mr. C. Hobhouse 1055

THE ST. LUCIA RIOTS.—Question, Major A. Gray, Sir G. Parker; Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) 1055

UNLICENSED CHINESE COOLIES IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Mr. Walsh (Lancashire, Ince), Sir B. Gurdon (Norfolk, N.), Mr. Scott (Ashton-under-Lyne), Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.), Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby) Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley) Mr. Crooks (Woolwich) The Speaker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1056

INDIANS IN THE TRANSVAAL.—Question, Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1058

COOLIES EDUCATION IN CEYLON.—Question, Mr. H. Beach; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1059

RUSSIA AND THE BRITISH FLEET.—Question, Mr. Thorne (West Ham, S.); Answer, The Secretary of State for foreign Affairs (Sir E. Grey, Northumberland, Berwick) 1059

NICARAGUAN OUTRAGE ON THE BRITISH FLAG.—Question, Major A. Gray; Answer, Sir E. Grey 1059

SANITATION IN EGYPT.—Questions, Dr. Rutherford; Sir. G. Parker; Answers, Sir E. Grey 1060

CAPTURE OF A BRITISH SUBJECT BY BRIGANDS AT SALONICA.—Questions, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Fell; Answer, Sir E. Grey 1061

"THE MIKADO."—Questions, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answers, Sir E. Grey 1062

BRITISH COMMERCIAL INTERESTS IN ASIA MINOR.—Question, Mr. Higham (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby); Answer, Sir E. Grey 1062

CHISWICK COUNCIL DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. Thorne; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department, Mr. Gladstone (Leeds, W.) 1063

PADDINGTON BOROUGH COUNCIL AND LOCAL TRADERS.—Question, Mr. C. Money (Paddington, N.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1063

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY COMPANY.—Question, Mr. M. MacDonald (Falkirk Burghs); Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade, Mr. Kearley (Devonport) 1064

WOOLWICH MECHANICS FOR GERMANY.—Question, Mr. Fell; Answer, Mr. Kearley 1064

CO-OPTED GUARDIANS.—Question, Mr. Summerbell (Sunderland); Answer, The President of the Local Government Board, Mr. J. Burns (Battersea) .. 1065

IRISH POOR LAW RETURNS.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy; Answer, Mr. J. Burns 1066

POSTAL ADDRESSES IN THE WELSH LANGUAGE.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, The Postmaster-General, Mr. S. Buxton (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1066

SICK LEAVE REGULATIONS IN THE POST OFFICE.—Questions, Mr. G. Clarke (Camberwell, Peckham), Major Anstruther-Gray; Answers, Mr. S. Buxton 1067

AUSTRALIAN MAIL CONTRACTS.—Question, Mr. W. Redmond (Clare, E.); Answer Mr. S. Buxton 1067

MUSIC IN LEEDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.—Question, Mr. O'Grady (Leeds, E.); Answer, The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education, Mr. Lough (Islington, W.) 1068

BEER INGREDIENTS.—Question, Mr. Morton; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Mr. Runciman (Dewsbury) 1068

POLICE PENSIONS AND INCOME-TAX.—Questions, Sir H. Vincent (Sheffield, Central), Mr. P. Barlow (Bedford); Answers, Mr. Runciman 1068

VILLAGE RIFLE CLUBS.—Question, Mr. H. Beach; Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1069

CLERKS TO SURVEYORS.—Questions, Mr. Hayden (Roscommon, S.), Mr. C. E. Price; Answers, Mr. Runciman 1069

BURWELL CROWN FARM.—Question, Mr. Bridgeman (Shropshire, Oswestry); Answer, The Treasurer of the Household, Sir E. Strachey (Somersetshire, E.) 1070

SCOTTISH CHURCHES DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. C. Wason (Orkney and Sheffield); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland, Mr. Sinclair (Forfarshire) 1071

DUMBARTON DRAINAGE WORKS.—Question, Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1071

IRELAND AND THE COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, The Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. Cherry (Liverpool, Exchange) 1072

CLARE EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. W. Redmond; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) 1072

IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1073

May 2.]

Page

LAMBERT MINORS ESTATE, ATHENRY.—Question, Mr. Duffy (Galway, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1073

LETTERMORE RELIEF OF DISTRESS SCHEME.—Question, Mr. O'Malley (Galway, Connemara); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1074

CLIFDEN PIER.—Question, Mr. O'Malley; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1074

ORANMORE OUTRAGE.—Question, Mr. Craig; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1075

UNITED IRISH LEAGUE—CLONFERT BRANCH.—Question, The Marquess of Hamilton (Londonderry); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1075

BROSNA OUTRAGE.—Question, Mr. Moore (Antrim, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell .. 1076

CRIME IN IRELAND—Questions, Mr. J. McVeagh (Down, S.), Mr. S. MacNeill, Captain Craig; Answers, Mr. Birrell 1076

LABOURERS' ACT (IRELAND).—Question, Mr. C. Craig; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1077

IRISH SALT FIRKIN BUTTER.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Sir E. Strachey 1077

NAVAL DEBATES AND THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.—Questions, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Bellairs; Answers, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1078

BRITISH INVESTMENTS IN THE COLONIES.—Questions, Sir H. Vincent, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyne); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1078

WOMEN ON LOCAL AUTHORITIES.—Question, Mr. Myer (Lambeth, N.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1079

STANDING COMMITTEES.—Question, Mr. C. Money; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1079

LORDS AND COMMONS.—Question, Mr. S. MacNeill; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1080

TRANSFER OF LAND—LEGAL COSTS.—Questions, Mr. G. Greenwood, Colonel Herbert (Monmouthshire, S.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman .. 1080

IRISH AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT VICE-PRESIDENCY.—Questions, Mr. Moore, Mr. J. Roche (Galway, E.); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1081

IRISH INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION.—Questions, Mr. Kettle (Tyrone, E.), Mr. W. Redmond (Waterford); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1081

EDUCATION BILLS.—Question, Mr. Clough (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1082

IMPERIAL DEFENCE.—Question, Mr. H. Beach; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1083

THE SESSION.—Questions, Mr. S. T. Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid), Mr. W. Redmond, Mr. R. Duncan (Lanarkshire, Govan), Mr. Myer; Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1083

May 2.]

Page

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.—Second Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1086

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection that they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee A: Mr. Harold Cox and Mr. Theodore Taylor; and had appointed in substitution: Dr. Shipman and Mr. Ridsdale.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B: Sir John Baker; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Theodore Taylor.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill): Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill): Mr. Moore.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill): Mr. Maddison, Mr. Alden, Sir John Benn, and Mr. Hart Davies; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill); Mr. John Ward, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Brunner, and Mr. Mond.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had added to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Seddon, Mr. Vivian, Mr. Brace, Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. McHugh, Mr. M'Killop, Mr. James Mason, Viscount Helmsley, Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, Mr. Abel Smith, Sir Samuel Scott, Mr. Long, Sir Frederick Banbury, Mr. Lambton, and Captain Balfour.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had added to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills the following fifteen Members (in respect of Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland Bill): Mr. Thomas Richards, Sir Walter Nugent, Mr. Sheehy, Mr. Boland, Mr. Lief Jones, Mr. Sherwell, Mr. Charles Roberts, Mr. Nield, Captain Faber, Mr. Ratcliff, Viscount Castlereagh, Mr. Remnant, Captain Craig, Mr. Meysey-Thompson, and Mr. Watson Rutherford.

Reports to lie upon the Table 1086

NEW BILL.

Local Authorities (Taxation and Purchase of Land) Bill.—"To provide for the Taxation and Purchase of Land by Local Authorities," presented by Mr. Thomasson; supported by Mr. Bell, Mr. Wedgwood, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. Harwood, Mr. Levy, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Alexander Harvey, Mr. John Robertson, and Mr. Snowden; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 30th May, and to be printed. [Bill 174.] .. 1087

May 2.] *Page*

SUPPLY [7th ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICE AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

CLASS III.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £36,985, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Commissioner of Police, the Police Courts, and the Metropolitan Police Establishment of Dublin."

Mr. Patrick White (*Meath, N.*) 1088
Mr. J. P. Nannetti (*Dublin, College Green*) 1095

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £36,885, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Patrick White*).

Mr. McKean (*Monaghan, S.*) 1098
Mr. William Redmond (*Clare, E.*) 1102
The Chief Secretary for Ireland (*Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.*) 1106
Mr. Kettle (*Tyrone, E.*) 1109

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

CLASS II.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £24,568, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland."

Mr. Delany (*Queen's County, Ossory*) 1113

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £24,468 be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Delany.*)

Mr. Moore (*Armagh, N.*) 1119
Mr. O'Dowd (*Sligo, S.*) 1122
Mr. Hugh Law (*Donegal, W.*) 1123
Sir Thomas Esmonde (*Wexford, N.*) 1124
The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (*Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury*) 1126
Mr. John O'Connor (*Kildare, N.*) 1133
Mr. Duffy (*Galway, S.*) 1137

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the Clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

LOWER THAMES TUNNEL RAILWAYS BILL (BY ORDER).—Second Reading deferred till Thursday next 1138

SUPPLY (CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES).

Postponed Proceeding on Question, " That a sum, not exceeding £24,468, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland."—(*Mr. Delany,*)—resumed.

Mr. Duffy 1138
Mr. Nannetti 1138

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question, " That a sum, not exceeding £24,568, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland," put, and agreed to.

3. £46,411, to complete the sum for Local Government Board, Ireland.

Mr. Ginnell (Westmeath, N.) 1139
Mr. Power (Waterford, E.) 1142
Mr. Boland (Kerry, S.) 1143
Mr. Birrell 1147
Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.) 1150
The Attorney-General for Ireland (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange) .. 1152
Mr. Moore 1154
Mr. Dillon (Mayo, E.) 1155
Mr. Charles Craig (Antrim, S.) 1156
Mr. James Campbell (Dublin University) 1157
Mr. Birrell 1160
Mr. T. L. Corbett (Down, N.) 1161
Sir Henry Craik (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) 1162
Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.) 1163

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

SUPPLY [25TH APRIL].

Resolutions reported.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907–8.

1. " That a sum, not exceeding £2,758,400 be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expenses of Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and

Abroad, including the cost of Superintendence, Purchase of Sites, Grants-in-Aid, and other charges connected therewth, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908."

2. "That a sum not exceeding £837,900 be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Half Pay, Reserved, and Retired Pay, to Officers of the Navy and Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1908."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £370,900, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Civil Pensions and Gratuities, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1908."

Resolutions agreed to 1164

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn"—(*Mr. Whiteley*)—put, and agreed to 1164

Adjourned accordingly at four minutes before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: FRIDAY, 3RD MAY, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Brighouse Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill; Shanklin Gas Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1165

Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction Railway Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1165

Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill.—As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time 1165

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Chester, Chorley, Fenton, Hanwell, Rochford (Rural), Scunthorpe, and the Thornton Joint Hospital District," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 175] 1165

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill.—"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Dunstable and the counties of West Suffolk and East Sussex and West Sussex," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 176] 1165

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.—Petition from Leicester, against; to lie upon the Table 1165

HOME WORK REGULATION BILL.—Petition of the Royal Sanitary Institute, against; to lie upon the Table 1165

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.—Petition from Huddersfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1165

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petitions in favour: From Dalny; Edinburgh (two); and Glasgow; to lie upon the Table 1166

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petitions against: From Guthlaxton; and Shrewsbury; to lie upon the Table 1166

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE.)—Petition from Guisborough, for legislation; to lie upon the Table 1166

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO CHILDREN BILL.—Petition of the Scottish Branch of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, in favour; to lie upon the Table 1166

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC (INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE) (MISCELLANEOUS, No. 2, 1907).—Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the International Conference on the White Slave Traffic, held in Paris, October, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1166

HARBOUR, ETC., BILLS (BURNHAM (SOMERSET) PIER BILL).—Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 2nd May; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 137] 1166

ARKLOW HARBOUR.—Copy presented, of Report of the Arklow Harbour Commissioners and Statement of Accounts for 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1166

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

IRISH RESIDENT MAGISTRATES—NAMES, AGES, RELIGIONS, AND SALARIES.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1166

RELIGIOUS VIEWS OF IRISH OFFICIALS.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1169

ROMAN CATHOLICS IN ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1170

HOUSES IN IRELAND VALUED AT £2 OR LESS.—Question Mr. J. MacVeagh; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1170

ADMINISTRATION OF IRISH AFFAIRS.—Question, Mr. Higham (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1171

May 3.] Page

Compulsory Weighing and Measurements Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. George Roberts (*Norwich*) 1171
Mr. Hodge (*Lancashire, Gorton*) 1176

Motion made and Question proposed " That this Bill be now read a second time."

The Secretary of State for the Home Department (*Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.*) 1179
Lord Balcarres (*Lancashire, Chorley*) 1182
Mr. Byles (*Salford*, N.) 1184
Mr. Watt (*Glasgow College*) 1184

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. Geo. Roberts.*)

Intestate Husband's Estate (Scotland) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Crombie (*Kincardineshire*) 1185
Mr. J. M. Henderson (*Aberdeenshire, W.*) 1186

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That this Bill be read a second time." —(*Mr. Crombie.*)

Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) 1186
The Lord Advocate (*Mr. Thos. Shaw, Hawick Burghs*) 1188
Lord Balcarres 1190

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question put, " That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House."—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

The House divided :—Ayes, 8 ; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 155.)

Bill committed to a Standing Committee.

Limited Partnerships Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Sir William Holland (*Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham*) 1191

Motion made, and Question proposed, " That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir F. Banbury 1194
Sir A. Torrance (*Glasgow, Central*) 1195
Sir F. Cawley (*Lancashire, Prestwich*) 1196
Mr. Beale (*Ayrshire, S.*) 1197
Sir A. Acland-Hood (*Somersetshire, Wellington*) 1198

Motion made and Question proposed, " That the debate be now adjourned." —(*Sir A. Acland Hood*).

May 6.] Page

The Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Herbert Samuel, Yorkshire, Cleveland) 1198

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed to a Standing Committee.

Jurors (Expenses) Bill.—Order for Second Reading read.

Mr. Lloyd Morgan (Carmarthenshire, W.) 1199

And notice being taken at twenty minutes before Three of the Clock that 40 Members were not present the House was told by Mr. Deputy-Speaker, and 19 Members only being present Mr. Deputy-Speaker retired from the Chair until Four of the Clock when the House was again told by Mr. Speaker, and 33 Members only being present, the House was adjourned by Mr. Speaker without a Question first put till Monday next.

Adjourned at Four o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS: MONDAY, 6th MAY, 1907.

The Lord Hawke took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) [H.L.]; Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Surrey, etc.) [H.L.]; Port Talbot Railway and Docks; South-Eastern, and London, Chatham and Dover Railways; Taff Vale Railway; London and North-Western Railway (Superannuation Fund); Grays and Tilbury Gas; Swansea Harbour.

Also the Certificates that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills:—Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1); Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table 1201

Maidstone Gas Bill.—The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The order made on the 24th of April last discharged. and Bill committed 1201

Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [H.L.]; Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.]; Kendal Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [H.L.]; Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [H.L.].—Read 3a, and passed, and sent to the Commons 1201

May 6.] Page

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill; Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Viscount Ridley be proposed to the House as a member of the Joint Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Leith of Fyvie; read, and agreed to 1201

Brighouse Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill; Shanklin Gas Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners 1202

Canal Tolls and Charges (New Junction Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to order) 1202

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.—Read 2ª (according to order), and committed.. 1202

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRANSVAAL.—Correspondence relating to the introduction of Chinese labourers into the Transvaal in excess of the number of licences issued 1202

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Reports and Statistics relating to continuation classes and central institutions, for the year 1905–1906 1202

MISCELLANEOUS No. 2 (1907).—Correspondence respecting the International Conference on the White Slave Traffic, held in Paris, October, 1906 1202

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.—No. 3773. France (Rouen). 1202

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Calendar of the manuscripts of the Marquess of Bath, preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire. Vol. II.
Report on the manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., preserved at Welbeck Abbey. Vol. VIII. 1202

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (SCOTLAND).—Twelfth Annual Report of the Local Government Board for Scotland, 1906 1202

ALIENS ACT, 1905.—First Annual Report of His Majesty's Inspector under the Aliens Act (Part I.), and a Statement with regard to the Expulsion of Aliens (Part II.), in respect of the year 1906 1202

EDUCATION COMMISSIONERS (IRELAND).—Annual Report for the year 1906 .. 1203

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1897.—Ninth Annual Report of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Board to the Secretary for Scotland.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table 1203

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND) PENSION FUND.—Account of receipts and payments in respect of the capital and income of the above fund, for the year ended 31st December, 1906 1203

ARKLOW HARBOUR.—Report of the Arklow Harbour Commissioners and Statement of Accounts for 1906 1203

May 6.] *Page*

SUPERANNUATION.—Treasury Minute, dated 30th April, 1907, declaring that Frederick Campion Forger, King's Yard, Gibraltar, War Office, was appointed without a civil service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table 1203

PUBLIC BILLS.—Return respecting. Laid before the House (pursuant to Order of the 28th of February last), and to be printed. (No. 51) 1203

House of Lords (Reform) Bill [H.L.].—[SECOND READING]. Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord Newton 1203

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Newton.*)

Earl Cawdor 1216

Amendment moved—

"That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the suggestions which have from time to time been made for increasing the efficiency of the House of Lords in matters affecting legislation, and to report as to the desirability of adopting them either in their original or in some modified form."—(*Earl Cawdor.*)

The Lord President of the Council (*The Earl of Crewe*) 1223
The Duke of Northumberland 1237
Lord Balfour of Burleigh 1243
Lord Heneage 1248
Lord Willoughby de Broke 1250
Lord Ampthill 1254
Lord Robertson 1263
The First Lord of the Admiralty (*Lord Tweedmouth*) 1268
The Earl of Halsbury 1272
The Earl of Dunraven 1281
Lord Montagu of Beaulieu 1290

On Question, debate adjourned till to-morrow, and to be taken first.

STANDING ORDERS RELATING TO APPEALS.—

The Lord Chancellor (*Lord Loreburn*) 1295

Moved, that Standing Orders Nos. I., V., VIII., and X. be amended as follows:—

NOTE.—The words in SMALL CAPITALS are to be omitted, and the words printed in *Italics* are to be inserted.

STANDING ORDER I.—(STANDING ORDER I. IS ONLY APPLICABLE TO DECREES, ETC., PRONOUNCED ON AND AFTER THE FIRST DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1876.)—Ordered, that, EXCEPT WHERE OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY STATUTE, no petition of appeal be received by this House unless the same be lodged in the Parliament Office for presentation to the House within one year from the date of the last decree, order, judgment, or interlocutor appealed from.

May 6.]

In cases in which the person entitled to appeal BE *is* within the age of one and twenty years, or covert, *non compos mentis*, imprisoned, or out of Great Britain and Ireland, such person may be at liberty to present his appeal to the House, provided that the same be lodged in the Parliament Office within one year next after full age, discoverture, coming of sound mind, enlargement out of prison, coming into Great Britain or Ireland: But in no case shall any person or persons be allowed a longer time, on account of mere absence, to present an appeal, than five years from the date of the last decree order, judgment, or interlocutor appealed against.

Provided that this Standing Order shall not apply to any appeal from the Court of Session in Scotland against a final interlocutor or interlocutory judgment pronounced before the first day of June, 1907; *but no such appeal shall be received by this House after the first day of June,* 1908.

STANDING ORDER V.

1. Ordered, that IN ENGLSH APPEALS the printed CASES *Case* and the Appendix thereto be in the Parliament Office within six weeks from the date of the representation of the appeal to the House; IN SCOTCH AND IRISH APPEALS, WITHIN EIGHT WEEKS; and the appeal *be* set down for hearing on the first *sitting* day *thereafter* AFTER THE EXPIRATION OF THOSE RESPECTIVE PERIODS (or as soon before, at the option of either party, as all the printed Cases and the Appendix shall have been lodged); on default by the Appellant, the Appeal to stand dismissed.

2. Ordered, that in all appeals from Scotland the Appellant alone, in his printed Case or in the Appendix thereto, shall lay before this House a copy of the record as authenticated by the Lord Ordinary; together with a supplement containing an account, without argument *or* OF statement of other facts of the further steps which have been taken in the case since the record was completed, and containing also copies of the interlocutors or parts of interlocutors complained of; and each party shall, in *his case,* THEIR CASES lay before the House a copy of the Case presented by *him* THEM RESPECTIVELY to the Court of Session, if any such Case was presented there, with a short summary of any additional reasons upon which he means to insist; and if there shall have been no case presented to the Court of Session, then each party shall set forth in his Case the reasons upon which he founds his argument, as shortly and succinctly as possible.

3. Ordered, that *the printed case* ALL PRINTED CASES be signed by one or more counsel who shall have attended as counsel in the Court below, or shall purpose attending as counsel at the hearing in this House.

STANDING ORDER VIII.

Ordered, that in the event of abatement by death or defect through bankruptcy, an appeal shall not stand dismissed for default under Standing Orders Nos. III., IV., V., provided that notice of such abatement or defect be given *by a letter from the Appellant's Agent* BY LETTER addressed to the Clerk of the Parliaments and lodged in the Judicial Office prior to the expiration of the period limited by the Standing Order under which the appeal would otherwise have stood dismissed.

Ordered, that all appeals marked on the Cause List of the House as abated or defective shall stand dismissed unless within three months from the date of the notice to the Clerk of the Parliaments of abatement or defect, if the House be then sitting, or, if not, then not later than the third sitting day of the next ensuing sittings of the House, a petition shall be presented to the House for reviving the appeal or for rendering the same effective

Ordered, that *when an appeal has abated or become defective after the printed cases have been lodged, and it is subsequently revived or rendered effective,* WHERE ANY PARTY OR PARTIES TO AN APPEAL SHALL DIE PENDING THE SAME, SUBSEQUENTLY TO THE PRINTED CASES HAVING BEEN LODGED, AND THE APPEAL SHALL BE REVIVED AGAINST HIS OR HER REPRESENTATIVE OR REPRESENTATIVES AS THE PERSON OR PERSONS SO DYING AS AFORESAID, a Supplemental Case shall be lodged by the *Appellant* PARTY OR PARTIES SO REVIVING THE SAME RESPECTIVELY, STATING *setting forth* the Order or Orders made by the House IN SUCH CASE *reviving the appeal or rendering the same effective.*

The like rule shall be observed by the Appellant and Respondent respectively, where any person or persons shall, by leave of the House, upon petition or otherwise, be added as a party or parties to the said appeal after the printed cases in such appeal shall have been lodged.

STANDING ORDER X.

Ordered, that the Clerk of the Parliaments shall appoint such person as he may think fit as Taxing Officer, and in all cases in which this House shall make any order for payment of costs by any party or parties in any cause, *the amount thereof to be certified by the Clerk of the Parliaments,* WITHOUT SPECIFYING THE AMOUNT, the Taxing Officer *shall* MAY, UPON THE APPLICATION OF EITHER PARTY, tax *the Bill of the costs so ordered to be paid*, and ascertain the amount thereof, and report the same to the Clerk of the Parliaments or Clerk Assistant: And, it is further ordered, that the same FEES *fee* shall be demanded from and paid by the party applying for such taxation for and in respect thereof as *is* ARE now *charged* or shall be fixed by any resolution of this House CONCERNING SUCH FEES; and *such fee shall be added at the foot of the said Bill of Costs as taxed* THE TAXING OFFICER MAY, IF HE THINK FIT, EITHER ADD OR DEDUCT THE WHOLE OR A PART OF SUCH FEES AT THE FOOT OF HIS REPORT: And the Clerk of the Parliaments or Clerk Assistant may give a certificate of such costs, expressing the amount so reported to him as aforesaid and in his certificate, *as well as in the Taxing Officer's Report*, regard shall be had to the sum of £200 where that amount has been paid in to the account of the Security Fund Account of the House as directed by Standing Order No. 4; and the amount in money certified by him in such certificate shall be the sum to be demanded and paid under or by virtue of such order as aforesaid for payment of costs. (*The Lord Chancellor*); agreed to: The said Standing Orders amended accordingly, and to be printed as amended. (No. 52.)

NEW BILL.

Employment of Women Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to repeal section 57 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, and certain words in Section 7 of the Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1887, relating to the employment of women and children—Was *presented* by the Earl Beauchamp; read 1ª; and to be printed. (No. 53.) 1298

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Tweleve o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS: MONDAY, 6TH MAY, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).—Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz. :—King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill [Lords]; Royal Bank of Scotland Bill [Lords]; Southend Water Bill [Lords]; Birmingham Corporation Water Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time 1299

Bristol Corporation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed 1299

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time 1299

Baines' Name Bill [Lords]; Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords].—Read a second time, and committed 1299

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill.—Reported [Parties do not proceed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed 1299

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.—Petition of the Personal Rights Association, Sarum and Wilts, against; to lie upon the Table 1299

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Petition from Langside, in favour; to lie upon the Table.. 1300

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.—Petitions against: From Middleton Cheney; and, Swayfield; to lie upon the Table 1300

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).—Petitions for legislation; From Swindon; and, Highworth; to lie upon the Table 1300

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EDUCATION (IRELAND).—Copy presented, of Annual Report of the Commissioners of Education in Ireland for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1300

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).—Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3773 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1300

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Twelfth Annual Report of the Local Government Board for Scotland, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1300

May 6.] *Page*

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1897.—Copy presented, of Ninth Annual Report of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Board to the Secretary for Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1300

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).—Copy presented, of Reports, Statistics, etc., on Continuation Classes and Central Institutions (Scotland), 1905-6 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1300

ALIENS ACT, 1905.—Copy presented, of First Annual Report of His Majesty's Inspector under the Aliens Act (Part I.), and a Statement with regard to the Expulsion of Aliens (Part II.), in respect of the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1300

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy presented, of Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Bath, preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire, Vol. II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1301

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).—Copy presented, of Report on the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., preserved at Welbeck Abbey, Vol. VIII. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table .. 1301

NATIONAL DEBT. — Copy presented, of Return showing; (1) the Aggregate Gross Liabilities of the State as represented by the Nominal Funded Debt, Estimated Capital Liability in respect of Terminable Annuities, Unfunded Debt, and other Liabilities in respect of Debt, the Estimated Assets, and the Exchequer Balances at the close of each financial year from 1835-6 to 1906-7, both inclusive; and (2) the Gross and Net Expenditure charged annually during that period against the Public Revenue on account of the National Debt, and other Payments connected with Capital Liabilities [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1301

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND) PENSION FUND.—Annual Accounts presented, of Receipts and Payments for the year ended 31st December, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1301

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.—Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 30th April, 1907, declaring that Frederick Campion, Forger, King's Yard, Gibraltar, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table 1301

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.—Copy presented, of Memorandum of Evidence contained in Parliamentary Papers as to the Demand for Allotments and Small Holdings, and as to the difficulty of obtaining land for those purposes [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1301

TRANSVAAL.—Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to the Introduction of Chinese Labourers into the Transvaal in excess of the number of Licences issued [by Command]; to lie upon the Table 1302

EAST INDIA (EXCISE COMMITTEE).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 18th April; *Mr. Herbert Roberts*]; to lie upon the Table 1302

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES

MR. DELMEGE'S GLENSHARROLD ESTATE.—Question, Mr. O'Shaughnessy (Limerick, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1302

May 6.] *Page*

Irish Money Lenders.—Question, Mr. Carr Gomm (Southwark, Rotherhithe); Answer, Sir John Walton 1302

Postage on Christmas Supplements.—Question, Mr. J. MacVeagh (Down, S.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1303

Plymouth Post Office Revision.—Question, Mr. J. O'Connor (Wicklow, W.); Mr. Sydney Buxton 1303

Mr. Mackay of Brora.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1303

Boyle Mounted Postmen.—Question, Mr. James O'Connor; Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1304

Income Tax Incidence.—Question, Lord Balcarres (Lancashire, Chorley); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1304

Madras Estates Land Bill.—Question, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs); Answer, Mr. Morley 1305

Mr. Langley's Gortnahoe Estate.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien (Tipperary Mid); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1305

Military Offences among Cavalrymen.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1306

Militia Reserve.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1306

Army Finance.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1306

Territorial Forces Increase Estimate.—Question, Sir Charles Dilke; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1307

New Hebrides Convention.—Question, Mr. Walrond (Devonshire, Tiverton); Answer, Sir Edward Grey 1307

Committee on the Bankruptcy Laws.—Question, Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central); Answer, Mr. Kearley 1308

Bute Licensing Appeals.—Question, Mr. Cleland (Glasgow, Bridgeton); Answer, Mr. Thomas Shaw 1308

Lord Advocate and Colonel Balfour.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Thomas Shaw 1308

Motor Car Bill.—Question, Mr. Walrond; Answer, Mr. Macnamara 1308

Military Drill in Elementary Schools.—Question, Mr. Byles (Salford, N); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1309

Lewisham Schools Rifle Association.—Question, Mr. Byles; Answer, Mr. McKenna 1309

Public Elementary School Buildings.—Question, Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1309

Page

EDUCATION BOARD MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.—Question, Mr. Wedgwood (Newcastle-under-Lyme); Answer, Mr. McKenna 1310

EDINBURGH GRASSMARKET.—Question, Mr. Gulland (Dumfries Boroughs); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 1310

AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES GRANT.—Question, Mr. C. B. Harmsworth (Worcestershire, Droitwich); Answer, Sir Edward Strachey 1311

LAHORE MASS MEETING.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale (Armagh, Mid.); Answer, Mr. Morley 1311

ULSTER JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.—Question, Mr. J. Devlin (Belfast, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1312

MUCKROSS BARYTES MINES.—Question, Mr. Edward Barry (Cork County, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1312

GALWAY LAND GRANT DEDUCTIONS.—Question, Mr. John Roche (Galway, E.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1313

LAND PURCHASE—LONGFORD CASE.—Question, Mr. J. P. Farrell (Longford, N.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1313

CAVAN URBAN COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1314

IRISH POOR LAW ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. O'Dowd (Sligo, S.); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1314

RATHKEALE DISTRICT COUNCIL.—Question, Mr. Arkwright (Hereford); Answer, Mr. Birrell 1315

IRISH POST OFFICE STONE BRANCHES.—Question, Mr. Field (Dublin, St. Patrick); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1316

SPECIAL COURTS FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS.—Question, Mr. J. W. Wilson (Worcestershire, N.); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1316

BISHOPSTOKE CHURCH.—Question, Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1316

DUMBARTON CHURCH DISPUTE.—Question, Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1317

SATURDAY HALF-HOLIDAYS FOR CIVIL SERVANTS.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1317

IRISH GOVERNMENT BANKING.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde (Wexford, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1317

CUSTOMS PROMOTIONS.—Question, Mr. Cleland: Answer, Mr. Runciman .. 1318

UNFUNDED DEBT.—Question, Mr. Ashton (Bedfordshire, Luton); Answer, Mr. Asquith 1319

May 6] Page

IRISH GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS.—Question, Sir Thomas Esmonde ; Answer, Mr. Asquith 1319

THE CHIEF OF AUNDH.—Question, Mr. Hart-Davies (Hackney, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Morley 1320

MADRAS LANDED ESTATE BILL.—Question, Mr. Rees ; Answer, Mr. Morley .. 1320

IRISH EDUCATION FINES.—Question, Mr. Kendal O'Brien ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1321

CALDBECK ESTATE, QUEEN'S COUNTY.—Question, Mr. Delany ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1321

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL INSPECTION.—Question, Mr. Murphy (Kerry, E.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1322

KENMARE'S EVICTED TENANTS.—Question, Mr. Murphy ; Answer, Mr. Birrell.. 1322

DE MONTALT ESTATE, DUNDOUM.—Question, Mr. Patrick White (Meath, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Birrell 1323

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

THE MIKADO.—Questions, Mr. George Faber (York), Major Anstruther-Grey (St. Andrews Burgh), Mr. Trevelyan (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland), and Viscount Turnour (Sussex, Horsham) ; Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty, Mr. Edmund Robert (Dundee) 1323

STORES FOR THE AUSTRALIAN SQUADRON.—Question, Mr. William Redmond (Clare, E.) ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1324

GOVERNMENT CONTRACT SPECIFICATIONS.—Question, Mr. Hunt (Shropshire, Ludlow) ; Answer, Mr. Edmund Robertson 1324

NEW CAVALRY SWORD.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool ; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddington) 1325

CAVALRY FOR SCOTLAND.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1326

NEW BAYONET.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray ; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1326

CAMP AND MESSING ALLOWANCES.—Question, Mr. Ashley ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1326

SOLDIERS WALKING-OUT UNIFORM.—Question, Mr. Ashley ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1326

LANCE-CORPORALS.—Questions, Mr. Ashley, Major Anstruther-Gray ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1326

MILITARY EXPENDITURE.—Question, Mr. Verney (Buckinghamshire, N.) ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1327

ENGINEERING STAFF.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson (Northumberland, Tyneside) ; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1328

May 6.]

Page

REGIMENTAL ADJUTANTS.—Question, Mr. Ashley; Answer, Mr. Haldane .. 1328

ARMY NOMENCLATURE.—Question, Sir C. Hill (Shrewsbury); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1328

CAMP MESSING ALLOWANCES.—Questions, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Lee (Hampshire, Fareham); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1328

PIERSHILL AND MARYHILL BARRACKS.—Questions, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson (Lanarkshire, N.W.), Mr. Watt (Glasgow, College); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1329

THE COUNTY ASSOCIATION AND THE REDUCTION OF THE AUXILIARY FORCES.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1329

WORK FOR WOOLWICH.—Question, Mr. Bellairs (Lynn Regis); Answer, Mr. Haldane 1330

LYDDITE SHELL MANUFACTURERS AT WOOLWICH.—Question, Mr. Bellairs; Answer, Mr. Haldane 1330

THE RIOTING AT RAWALPINDI.—Questions, Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs), Major Anstruther-Gray, Sir H. Cotton (Nottingham, E.), Captain Faber (Hampshire, Andover); Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs) 1331

CASE OF CAPTAIN GROGAN.—Questions, Mr. Smeaton (Stirlingshire), Mr. J. Ward (Stoke-on-Trent), Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E.); Answer, The Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.) .. 1333

DINIZULU'S LIBEL ACTION.—Question, Mr. J. M. Robertson; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1334

REPATRIATION OF CHINESE COOLIES.—Question, Viscount Turnour, Sir Gilbert Parker (Gravesend), Captain Craig (Down, E.), Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Viscount Helmsley (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk); Answer, Mr. Churchill .. 1334

ADMISSION OF UNLICENSED COOLIES INTO THE TRANSVAAL.—Questions, Mr. J. Ward, Mr. G. Greenwood (Peterborough), Mr. Scott (Ashton-under-Lyne), Mr. Walsh (Lancashire, Ince), Dr. Rutherford (Middlesex, Brentford), Mr. Byles (Salford, N.), Mr. Stewart (Greenock), Mr. Nicholls (Northamptonshire, N.), Mr. Mackarness (Berkshire, Newbury), Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby), Mr. Crooks (Woolwich), Mr. Austin Taylor (Liverpool, East Toxteth), Mr. Lupton (Lincolnshire, Sleaford), Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester); Answer, Mr. Churchill 1335

BRITISH SETTLERS IN THE ORANGE RIVER COLONY.—Question, Mr. Lonsdale Armagh, Mid.), Sir Gilbert Parker; Answer, Mr. Churchill 1344

MR. ABBOTT'S RANSOM FROM TURKISH BRIGANDS.—Question, Mr. Byles; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the Treasury (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury) 1344

ALBANIAN OUTRAGE AT USHUB.—Question, Major Anstruther-Gray; Answer, Mr. Runciman 1345

May 6.] Page

BAPTIST MISSION ON THE CONGO.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester), Answer, Mr. Runciman 1345

THE LORD CHAMBERLAIN.—Question, Mr. Vincent Kennedy (Cavan, W.); Answer, The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman) 1348

COUNTY OF LONDON LICENSING COMPENSATION FUND.—Question, Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn); Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1348

ILLEGAL STORAGE OF AMMUNITION.—Question, Viscount Turnour; Answer, Mr. Gladstone 1348

LONDON POSTAL SERVICE OVERSEERS.—Question, Mr. A. Allen (Christchurch); Answer, The Postmaster-General (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar) 1349

WAREHAM POSTMASTER'S GRIEVANCE.—Question, Colonel R. Williams (Dorsetshire, W.); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1350

CABLE TELEGRAPHISTS' ALLOWANCES.—Question, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland); Answer, Mr. Sydney Buxton 1351

NESS AND BEAULY FISHERY RIGHTS.—Question, Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty); Answer, The Secretary for Scotland (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire) 1351

SMALL HOLDINGS IN COUNTY ROXBURGH.—Question, Mr. Smeaton; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1352

SPORTING ESTATES IN ABERDEENSHIRE.—Question, Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald; Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1352

DOG POISONING IN SUTHERLAND.—Question, Mr. Morton (Sutherland); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1353

SCOTTISH LANDLORDS' CLAIM TO SEAWEED.—Questions, Mr. Cathcart Wason (Orkney and Shetland), Mr. Byles, Mr. Flavin (Kerry, N.); Answer, Mr. Sinclair 1353

IRISH BOARD OF WORKS STAFF.—Question, Mr. Delany (Queen's County, Ossory); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1354

DUBLIN COUNTY COUNCIL AND LAND PURCHASE.—Question, Mr. Clancy (Dublin County, N.); Answer, Mr. Runciman 1355

PRINCE BUELOW AND DISARMAMENT.—Question, Captain Craig; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1356

LORDS-LIEUTENANT OF COUNTIES.—Question, Mr. Whitehead (Essex, S.E.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1356

COST OF POOR LAW ADMINISTRATION.—Question, Mr. Pike Pease; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1357

STATE-AIDED EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITIES — Question, Mr. Murray Macdonald (Falkirk Burghs); Answer, Sir H. Campbell Bannerman 1357

COLONIAL CONFERENCE—DEBATE ON PREFERENCE.—Questions, Captain Craig, Viscount Turnour, Mr. Arthur Lea (Hampshire, Fareham), Mr. Pike Pease, Mr. Remnant (Finsbury, Holborn); Answers, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Asquith, Fife, E.) 1358

REPORTS OF COLONIAL CONFERENCES.—Question, Mr. Stanger (Kensington, N.); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1360

LAND VALUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.—Question, Mr. C. E. Price (Edinburgh, Central), Captain Faber, Lord R. Cecil, Mr. Lea (St. Pancras, E); Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1360

IRISH COUNCIL BILL.—Question, Mr. Barrie (Londonderry, N.), Captain Craig; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1361

POLITICAL PENSIONS.—Question, Mr. Watt; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1362

PACIFIC ISLANDERS ACT.—Question, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1362

BLOCKING MOTIONS AND BILLS.—Questions, Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood), Lord R. Cecil; Answer, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman 1362

Advertisements Regulation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 138.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 138.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 177] 1363

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).—Sir BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill): Major McMicking; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill): Mr. Timothy Davies.

Report to lie upon the Table 1364

Small Holdings (No 3) Bill.—Order for Second Reading upon Friday read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn. 1364

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill (ALLOCATION OF TIME).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Motion for the Allocation of Time for the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 313; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 156.) .. 1364

May 6.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill (ALLOCATION OF TIME).

The Prime Minister and First Lord of the Treasury (*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs*) 1367

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Committee stage and Report stage of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, including the Financial Resolution relating thereto, shall be proceeded with in the following manner: (*a*) That Clauses 1 and 2 and the Committee stage of the Financial Resolution be proceeded with, and proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day; (*b*) That the Report stage of the Financial Resolution and Clauses 3 and 4 be proceeded with, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day; (*c*) That Clauses 5 to 7 be proceeded with, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the third allotted day; (*d*) That Clauses 8 to 12 be proceeded with, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day; (*e*) That Clauses 13 to 27 be proceeded with, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day; (*f*) That the remaining Clauses of the Bill and the Schedules, and any new Government clauses and any new Government Schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Committee Stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with and brought to a conclusion on the sixth allotted day, and that the Chairman report the Bill to the House without Question put; (*g*) That two allotted days be given to the Report Stage of the Bill, and that new clauses and Clauses 1 to 15 of the Bill be proceeded with on the first of those allotted days, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day, and that the remaining clauses of the Bill and the Schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Report Stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with on the second of those allotted days and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day.

"After this Order comes into operation, any day (other than a Friday) shal be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day, or on which any stage of the Financial Resolution relating thereto is put down as the first Order of the Day, followed by the Bill.

"At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business allotted to that day are to be brought to a conclusion, the Chairman or Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question or any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or Schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the clause or Schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

"At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the Day, or if that day is a Friday at 5 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

" Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not, on any allotted day on which proceedings or any business are to be brought to a conclusion under this Order, be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the sittings of the House.

" After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill (including the Financial Resolution relating thereto) stand as first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Mr. A. J. Balfour (City of London) 1374
Sir Charles Dilke (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) 1380
Mr. Laurence Hardy (Kent, Ashford) 1382
Mr. Ashley (Lancashire, Blackpool) 1384
Mr. Wyndham (Dover) 1385
The Secretary of State for War (Mr. Haldane, Haddingtonshire) 1390
Mr. J. Ramsay Macdonald (Leicester) 1394
Lord R. Cecil (Marylebone, E.) 1396
Mr. Mildmay (Devonshire, Totnes) 1399

Amendment proposed—

" To leave out all after the 'word 'that' to the end, in order to add the words 'it is inexpedient that any further Resolutions dealing with the allocation of time for particular Bills should be passed except as part of a general system by which the liberties of this House shall be properly safeguarded.' "—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, " That the words the Committee stage and Report stage of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill,' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Soares (Devonshire, Barnstaple) 1402
Mr. Bowles (Lambeth, Norwood) 1404
Major Seely (Liverpool, Abercromby) 1407
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1408
Mr. Evans (Glamorganshire, Mid.) 1412
Mr. Courthope (Sussex, Rye) 1413
Mr. Markham (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) 1415

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 324 ; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 157.)

Mr. Victor Cavendish (Derbyshire, W.) 1419

Amendment proposed—

" In line 2, to leave out the words 'including the financial Resolution relating thereto.' "—(*Mr. Cavendish.*)

Mr. William Rutherford (Liverpool, West Derby) 1422
Mr. Haldane 1423
Captain Craig (Down, E.) 1423

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

Great Northern and City Railway Bill (By Order).—Order for consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

Mr. Morton (Sutherland) 1424
Mr. Weir (Ross and Cromarty) 1426

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade (Mr. Kearley, Devonport) 1427
Mr. D. A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydvil) 1428
Mr. Rees (Montgomery Boroughs) 1429
Mr. E. H. Lamb (Rochester) 1432
Mr. Edmund Lamb (Herefordshire, Leominster) 1432

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Central London Railway Bill. [By Order].—Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Mr. Morton 1433

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

Mr. Kearley 1435
Mr. Moore (Armagh, N.) 1436

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

Business of the House (Territorial and Reserve Forces) Bill (Allocation of Time).

Postponed Proceeding on Amendment to Question, "That the Committee stage and Report stage of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, including the Financial Resolution relating thereto, shall be proceeded with in the following manner :—(a) That Clauses 1 and 2 and the Committee stage of the Financial Resolution be proceeded with and proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day ; (b) That the Report stage of the Financial Resolution and Clauses 3 and 4 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day ; (c) That Clauses 5 to 7 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the third allotted day ; (d) That Clauses 8 to 12 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day ; (e) That Clauses 13 to 27 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day ; (f) That the remaining clauses of the Bill and the schedules, and any new Government clauses and any new Government schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with and brought to a conclusion on the sixth allotted day, and that the Chairman report the Bill to the House without Question put ; (g) That two allotted days be given to the Report stage of the Bill, and that new clauses and Clauses 1 to 15 of the Bill be proceeded with on the first of those allotted days and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day, and that the remaining clauses of the Bill and the schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Report stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with on the second of those allotted days and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day.

After this Order comes into operation, any day (other than a Friday) shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day, or on which any stage of the Financial Resolution relating thereto is put down as the first Order of the Day, followed by the Bill.

At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business allotted to that day are to be brought to a conclusion, the Chairman or Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the Day, or if that day is a Friday at 5 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not, on any allotted day on which proceedings or any business are to be brought to a conclusion under this Order, be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House.

May 6.] Page

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill (including the Financial Resolution relating thereto) stand as first Order of the day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion for adjournment under Standing Order 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Which Amendment was—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'including the Financial Resolution relating thereto.'"—(*Mr. Cavendish.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

Captain Craig 1440
Sir Howard Vincent (*Sheffield, Central*) 1441
Lord Balcarres (*Lancashire, Chorley*) 1441
Sir F. Banbury (*City of London*) 1443
Mr. Austen Chamberlain (*Worcestershire, E.*) 1444
Mr. Haldane 1446
Mr. A. J. Balfour 1448

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 286 ; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 158.)

Mr. Wyndham 1451

Amendment proposed—

"In line 10, to leave out from the word 'That,' to the word 'allotted,' in line 20, and insert the words 'the remaining Clauses of the Bill and the Schedules, and any new Government Clauses and any new Government Schedules and any other matter necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with and brought to a conclusion on the seventh.'"—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Resolution."

Mr. Haldane 1453
Mr. Austen Chamberlain 1454

Question put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 293 ; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 159.)

Amendment proposed—

"In line 60, at the end, to add the words, 'After the passing of this order on any day on which any proceedings on the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, including the financial Resolution relating thereto, stand as first order of the day, no opposed private business shall be taken.'"—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

Question, " That those words be there added," put, and agreed to.

Main Question, as amended, put.

The House divided :—Ayes, 333 ; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 160.)

Ordered, That the Committee stage and Report stage of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, including the financial Resolution relating thereto, shall be proceeded with in the following manner :—(*a*) That Clauses 1 and 2 and the Committee stage of the financial Resolution be proceeded with and proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day ; (*b*) That the Report stage of the financial Resolution and Clauses 3 and 4 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day ; (*c*) That Clauses 5 to 7 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the third allotted day ; (*d*) That Clauses 8 to 12 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day ; (*e*) That Clauses 13 to 27 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day ; (*f*) That the remaining clauses of the Bill and the schedules, and any new Government clauses and any new Government schedules and any other matters necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with and brought to a conclusion on the sixth allotted day, and that the Chairman report the Bill to the House without Question put ; (*g*) That two allotted days be given to the Report stage of the Bill, and that new clauses and Clauses 1 to 15 of the Bill be proceeded with on the first of those allotted days and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day, and that the remaining clauses of the Bill and the schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Report stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with on the second of those allotted days and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day.

After this Order comes into operation, any day (other than a Friday) shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day, or on which any stage of the financial Resolution relating thereto is put down as the first Order of the Day, followed by the Bill.

At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which Proceedings on any business allotted to that day are to be brought to a conclusion, the Chairman or Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the Day, or if that day is a Friday at 5 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

May 6.] **Page**

Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not, on any allotted day on which proceedings or any business are to be brought to a conclusion under this Order, be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House.

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill (including the financial Resolution relating thereto) stand as first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate.

After the passing of this Order on any day on which any proceedings on the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, including the financial Resolution relating thereto, stand as first Order of the Day, no opposed Private Business shall be taken.—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes after Eleven o'clock.

END OF TABLE OF CONTENTS TO VOLUME CLXXIII.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(AUTHORISED EDITION)

IN THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT* OF THE UNITED
KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*, APPOINTED TO MEET
THE TWELFTH DAY OF FEBRUARY IN THE SEVENTH YEAR OF THE
REIGN OF

HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

FIFTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1907.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 24th April, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill. Read 2^{a}, and committed for Tuesday next.

Basingstoke Gas Bill; Keswick Urban District Council (Water) Bill. Read 2^{a}, and committed.

Maidstone Gas Bill. Read 2^{a}, and committed. The Committee to be proposed by the Committee of Selection.

Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway Bill. Brought from the Commons, read 1^{a}, and referred to the Examiners.

Portishead District Water Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee had not proceeded with the consideration of the Bill, no parties having appeared in opposition thereto; read, and ordered to lie on the Table. The orders made on the 4th and 18th of March last discharged, and Bill committed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1877.

Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Prison Commissioners for Scotland, being the Sixty-eighth Annual Report on Prisons in Scotland.

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887.

Return of the number of eviction notices filed during the quarter ended 31st March, 1907.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (COUNTY BOROUGH OF SWANSEA).

Order made by the council of the county borough of Swansea, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the

Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the county borough. Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

STATUTE LAW REVISION BILL [H.L.].

Order of the Day for the House to be in Committee, read, and discharged.

RULE COMMITTEE BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order). Bill reported without Amendment. Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3^a to-morrow.

House adjourned at twenty-five minutes before Five o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 24th April, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

North East London Railway Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 6).

The Chairman of Ways and Means informed the House that, the Committee on Group 6 of Railway Bills not being appointed to meet until To-morrow, the parties opposing the London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill, which was set down for consideration upon the first day of the meeting of the Committee, had appeared before him and proved that the evidence of Sub-Divisional Inspector Arthur Sims, of the Y Division of the Metropolitan Police, of Platt Street Police Station, Saint Pancras, N.W., was essential to their case, and that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House.

Ordered, That Sub-Divisional Inspector Arthur Sims do attend the Committee on Gloup 6 of Railway Bills to-morrow, at half-past eleven of the clock.

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill. Reported [preamble not proved]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 5).

Sir Lewis M'Iver reported from the Committee on Group 5 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday next, at eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

BUTTER AND MARGARINE BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petition from Rhymney, in favor; to lie upon the Table.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; From Edinburgh, and, Leith; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING ACTS.

Two petitions from Trafford Park, for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; From Arbroath; Dumbarton; Edinburgh; Glasgow; Mid Argyll: Portobello; Selkirk; and, Shettleston; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; From Annan; Arbroath (two); Banchory Ternaw; Bannockburn; Bervie; Bishopbriggs; Bonhill; Broughty Ferry; Callander; Calton; Camelon; Campbeltown; Chryston; Coalburn; Cuminestown; Dollar (two); Dumbarton; Dundee (six);

Edinburgh (five); Falkirk (three); Fraserburgh; Galashiels; Garlieston; Girvan; Glasgow (eighteen); Gourdon Grangemouth; Greenock; Johnstone; Keith; Kilmarnock; Kincardine; Kirkintilloch (two); Larkhall (two); Lauder; Maxwelltown; Milltown; Milnathort; Motherwell; Muirkirk; Nitshill; Partick; Perth (two); Portessie; Rosehearty; Saltcoats; Scotstown; Sorbie; Shettleston; Stevenston; Stranraer (two); Uddington; Whiteinch (two); and, Wynde; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL VETO) BILL.

Petition from Staveley, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition from Lewisham, against; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition for legislation; from Burnley and Hastings; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Petition from West Stockwith, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF WHISKEY BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Trade Protection Society against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF TRADE (REPORTS).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 23rd April; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 126.]

LAND LAW (IRELAND) ACT, 1887 (EVICTION NOTICES).

Copy presented, of Return of Eviction Notices filed during the quarter ended 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented of Order made by the Council of the County Borough of Swansea, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the County Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Twenty-ninth Annual Report of the Prisons Commissioners for Scotland, being the Sixty-eighth Annual Report on Prisons in Scotland, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AFRICA (No. 1, 1907).

Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the Independent State of the Congo [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EGYPT (No. 3, 1907).

Copy presented, of Despatch from the Earl of Cromer, respecting proposals of the Egyptian General Assembly [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Miscellaneous Series, No. 659 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3768 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL CONTRIBUTIONS (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "of all Moneys contributed out of the rates by the county council and other local bodies in each county in Ireland during the financial year 1906–7, for the purposes of schemes under The Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 170, of Session 1906)."—(*Mr. Ginnell.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS. CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Soldiers Employed by the Post Office.

Mr. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can state the number of men the Post Office has asked the War Office to supply for use in the Telegraph Department during the forthcoming summer; what number of vacancies on the permanent establishment he has decided to reserve for these men; and whether these preferential appointments will be at the expense of those hitherto reserved for the ex-messengers, or from those recruited from open competition.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The military telegraphists recently employed in the postal telegraph service consist of a group of twelve ex-soldiers who are at present engaged as probationary telegraphists. These men will, if satisfactory, be appointed to established posts in the Central Telegraph Office under the conditions stated in my Answer to my hon. friend on the 11th instant, *i.e.*, they will be placed on the same scale as that in force for other telegraphists in the same office. As my hon. friend is already aware from previous Answers, the chief object of employing these ex-soldiers as telegraphists is to enable a larger number of vacancies to be left for the ex-telegraph messengers. These appointments will therefore be to the benefit of the ex-messengers, and will not result in a larger number of ex-soldiers being employed in the postal service. Besides the above, there are a few soldiers still serving with the colours to whom the acquisition of a knowledge of telegraphy will be an advantage, and who are temporarily engaged with a view to the reduction of excessive overtime in provincial offices during the coming summer. The number will probably not exceed twenty. As regards these, there is no question of appointment on the establishment.

Mr. STEADMAN: To ask the Postmaster-General whether the Estimates for the year ending 31st March, 1907, showed that 1,736 male telegraphists were attached to the Central Telegraph Office, while for the current year the number is stated to be 1,659; whether the Department is employing soldiers on telegraph duties in this office, paying them 6s. 6d. per week for an attendance of forty-eight hours weekly; and whether he will explain why he has reduced the permanent staff and resorted to the use of military casual labour.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The reduction in the force of male telegraphists employed in the Central Telegraph Office during the current year is due to diminution of work in that office and has no connection whatever with the recent employment of a small number of ex-soldiers in that office. As I stated in my Answers to my hon. friend on the 21st March and 11th instant, the object with which these men are employed is with a view of leaving a larger number of vacancies for ex-telegraph messengers and not with the view, nor with the result, of employing a large number of ex-soldiers in the postal service. I have already explained that it is not a question of "casual" labour, nor of cheapening labour. If these men, after their probationary period, are found to give satisfaction, they will be appointed on the establishment on the same scale as that in force for the telegraphists in the same office.

Transfers of Irish School Inspectors.

Mr. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that it is customary for the Commissioners of National Education to transfer their inspectors of national schools every three years, and that more than half these inspectors were transferred at 1st April, 1906; whether he is aware that inspectors, as a rule, give unfavourable reports against which the Board will allow no appeal or re-examination, on their first visits to schools, when reports equal to the two preceding reports would mean promotion; whether his attention has been called to a resolution of the Irish National Teachers' Organisation, requesting that no teacher who had got two consecutive reports up to the required standard for promotion should be disallowed that promotion through the first report of any inspector; if so, will he say whether the Board will comply with that resolution when considering the promotions during the year commencing the 1st instant upon the inspectors' reports for the three preceding years; if not, how many teachers will be disallowed to first grade and first-of-first grade respectively through the Board's non-compliance with that request; and will he, in view of the slowness of promotion, impress on the Board the desirability of complying with the request mentioned.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that there is no fixed rule as to the transfer of inspectors from one circuit to another. The period for which an inspector may be retained in any district depends on the exigencies of the service. It is not the case, as stated, that inspectors as a rule make unfavourable reports on their first visits to schools, when reports equal to the two preceding reports would mean promotion. In January last the Commissioners received from the National Teachers' Association a resolution to the effect stated in the Question. They do not, however, consider it necessary or desirable to adopt the suggestion contained in the resolution. The Commissioners cannot at present say in how many cases promotion will be disallowed. The question of the promotion of teachers is one entirely for the Commissioners, and I am afraid that I cannot interfere with their discretion in the matter.

Endowed Schools Commissioners and the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests for Ireland.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Endowed Schools Commissioners and the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests for Ireland are the same persons; are all permanent charities and endowments in Ireland now under the control of these bodies; by whom are inspectors appointed over the various properties and institutions; on whose recommendation; what are the qualifications for these inspectorships; how are the inspectors paid, and by whom; how is performance of duty vouched; and will he grant, if moved for, a Return of all the charities and endowed institutions now under the control of these two bodies of Commissioners, showing the date of foundation or acquisition, name of founder, nature of property, original and present value, annual yield, annual expenditure, and how applied.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The two bodies of Commissioners referred to do not consist of the same persons. The Endowed Schools Commissioners, whose statutory title is the Commissioners of Education in Ireland, have control of certain endowments connected with education. The Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests have vested in them certain charitable and pious bequests, and have powers for protecting and controlling charities other than those vested in them. In this regard I would refer the hon. Member to the Acts 7 and 8 Vic., c. 97, 30 and 31 Vic., c. 54, and 34 and 35 Vic., c. 102. Inspectors of the endowments under the control of the Commissioners of Education are appointed by the Lord-Lieutenant under Section 17 of The Educational Endowments (Ireland) Act, 1885. The Lord-Lieutenant satisfies himself as to the competency of the persons whom he appoints, and subsequently as to the satisfactory performance of the duty. The annual fee payable to an inspector ranges from £1 1s. to £3 3s., and is a charge on the endowment. In many cases of small endowments the duty of inspection is performed without fee. The Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests do not employ inspectors. I am advised that no public purpose, commensurate with the labour involved, would be served by the preparation of the Return suggested. To prepare such a Return extensive inquiries reaching back for centuries would be necessary, I would, however, refer the hon. Member to the Annual Reports presented to Parliament by each of the bodies in question.

The Land Policy of the Government—The Prime Minister and the Demand for Land.

MR. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): To ask the Prime Minister on what official information he has relied in making the statement that in one district after another the demand for land for the purposes of use and labour is met with blank denial; and whether he can lay such information before the House, giving the names of the districts to which he referred.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) The following cases, taken from the return on The Small Holdings Act, 1892, dated August 15th, 1895, show that county councils were in many instances unable to obtain land by agreement:—

Bedford.—Your Committee have made careful inquiry and find that . . . there is no reasonable prospect of the council being able to obtain the land. . . . Your Committee, therefore, cannot advise the council to put the statute into operation.

Cornwall.—The Committee endeavoured to obtain land in different parts of the county, but found that in some instances the land applied for already formed part of small tenements, and that in others the owners were unwilling to part with the land.

Dorset.—From this inquiry and from other sources the sub-Committee believe that considerable difficulty would be experienced in obtaining available land.

London.—The great proportion of the owners have either refused to entertain the council's advances altogether, or have made difficulties by coupling their consent with impossible or unreasonable conditions, so that little progress has hitherto been made in this direction.

Warwick.—The chairman of the council reported on inquiry that if land were available, it would be taken up to a fair amount by the labourers and tradesmen. The Committee subsequently reported that it had not been practicable to obtain land.

Northumberland.—It appearing to the Committee that land at Harbottle, suitable, in the opinion of the Committee, for small holdings cannot be obtained, resolved that an intimation to that effect be given to the applicants there. It appearing to the Committee that land at Leamington suitable, in the opinion of the Committee, cannot be obtained, resolved that intimation to that effect be given to the applicants there. The sub-Committee appointed to negotiate for the purchase of land at Haydon Bridge reported verbally that . . . they had not been able to negotiate the purchase of suitable land.

Wilts.—At Broadchalk, where there were seven applicants for small holdings, suitable land was pointed out, but the Committee were unable to come to terms with the owner, and the proposal fell through.

Some specific instances of the difficulties experienced by the rural sanitary authorities in obtaining land for allotments before the passing of the Local Government Act of 1894 may be found in the House of Commons' Return of June 20th, 1892 (No. 310). Land could not be obtained at all by agreement in the rural districts of Buckingham (Bucks.), Whittlesey (Cambridgeshire), Braintree (Essex), Tetbury (Gloucester), Isle of Thanet and Blean (Kent), Banbury and Thame (Oxford), and Cosford (Sussex).

In giving evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Small Holdings in 1890, Mr. Fyffe, the estates bursar of University College, Oxford, described an estate in Sussex, covering an area of 20 square miles, of which no portion could be bought at any price.

The evidence given before the recent Departmental Committee on Small Holdings abounds with instances of the practical impossibility in many cases of obtaining land. The following cases may be mentioned. Lord Onslow's Report on a visit to the small holdings in Worcestershire states, "The men endeavoured to obtain land from a neighbouring landowner, but a rule on the estate was not to let more than a quarter of an acre to labourers."

Mr. Winfrey's Evidence.

Question 1989. With regard to the parochial parish which includes Holbeach St. Mark's and Holbeach Bank, it comprises no fewer than 21,133 acres, being the largest parochial parish in England. The applicants asked altogether for 146 acres of land, but we were not able to find a willing seller under the Small Holdings Act in that enormously large parish. The Crown has land in the parish, and a committee of the county council was appointed to interview the Commissioners of Woods and Forests. We asked the Commissioners to sell us some land; but they declined to sell, alleging that it would be detrimental to the future disposition of the Crown estate.

Question 1993. In the case of Whaplode we advertised for suitable land, and we had land eventually offered to us, but at a price which the Committee thought was prohibitive. It really was prohibitive, being about 20 per cent. higher than the market price of land in the district.

Miss Jebb's Evidence.

Question 7831. Is it your belief that men have gone into the towns because they were unable to get land?—I have certainly met with that in a great many cases.

Question 7832. You did meet with it in actual practice?—Yes.

Question 7909. Probably you know of many cases in which families have left the country, and gone to the towns, because they could not get land to occupy as small holders?—I know of a good many young men, sons of small holders or small farmers, having done so.

Question 7910. And probably you have known of whole families going to the towns because it was impossible to get a small holding?—I think I could refer you to cases of whole families if I were to go to the different districts I have visited, but it is more the younger men who drift from the country into the towns on this account. Of course, it comes to the same thing in the end.

Mr. James Stewart's Evidence.

Question 9017. But had you a garden at your cottage to begin with at Rattray? —Yes, and then I took an acre. I was at the landlord for four years for that acre before I got it. I got it because I wanted to keep things together.

Question 9019. You had difficulty in finding any land?—Yes.

The President of the Board of Agriculture informs me that he has this week received a petition (copy attached), signed by all the members of the Parish Council of Moulton, near Spalding, pointing out the pressing demand for land for small holdings in the neighbourhood. The parish contains 12,000 acres of excellent land, and has a population of 2,017. Nearly half the land in the parish is occupied by twenty tenants, three of them holding nearly 3,000 acres. There are 151 allotment holders in the parish, but they can make no progress owing to the impossibility of obtaining more land. The average rent of the existing small holders is about 33 per cent. more than the average rent of the larger farms. As long ago as 1893 the Small Holdings Committee of the Holland County Council received applications for small holdings and held an inquiry in the parish, but no land could be obtained, and, though continued efforts have been made since that time, the applications still remain unsatisfied. At least six other similar inquiries have been held in neighbouring parishes at intervals since the passing of the Act of 1892, but in each case the result has been the same.

(*Copy*)

Moulton, Near Spalding,
April 15*th*, 1907.

To the Right Hon. Earl Carrington,
President of the Board of Agriculture.

We, the undersigned, members of the Moulton Parish Council, assembled at the annual meeting, respectfully desire to draw your Lordship's attention to the pressing demand for small holdings in this and surrounding parishes in South Lincolnshire.

In the past, vacant farms have usually been let to progressive farmers; and small holders and would-be small holders have been passed by. As things are at present it is almost impossible for an industrious and capable man to hire a small holding except at an exhorbitant rent. Even at such rent the holdings available are very few.

This large parish contains about 12,000 acres of fertile land, nearly all of which is suitable for cultivation by small holders.

Nearly 3,000 acres are held by three tenants out of a population of 2,017, living in 463 houses; twenty tenants occupy nearly half the land in the parish, upwards of 5,000 acres.

We believe that this distribution of the land is typical of the parishes in South Lincolnshire.

The rents paid by existing small holders run to £5 per acre including the house and buildings. There are five small holdings in the parish, cultivated as ordinary agricultural land, rented at £4 and upwards per acre.

The average rent of all existing small holdings is about 33 per cent. more than the average rent of the larger farms. The larger farms are well equipped as a rule with house, cottages, and buildings; the small holdings are often badly equipped with buildings. Several persons pay a separate rent for a house and buildings, and then hire odd fields at rentals of 50s. and 60s. per acre.

The parish council hires allotment land from five landowners which it has to let at rents varying from £2 to £3 per acre, inclusive of rates. This land has no buildings of any kind upon it.

There are 151 allotment holders in the parish. Under existing circumstances they can make no progress. Several of these desire to become small holders. There is also a strong demand for land from persons who would not require houses. But the experience of members of this council is that holdings of from 25 acres upwards with cottages and buildings on them are chiefly required.

There are capable men with money saved and friends willing to assist, ready to take and work such holdings; hundreds more in the future would come forward for such holdings if only they could see a prospect of obtaining them.

The parish council desire, if they may do so, to add that where the land is suitable, the question of buildings need be no obstacle. The small holder can live and afford to pay the same rent as paid by the larger farmer and, in addition, a fair interest upon any reasonable sum necessary to furnish the land with houses and buildings.

(*Signed*) F. Webster, *Chairman.*
,, J. France, *Vice-Chairman*
,, W. Ginn.
,, G. Ventus.
,, H. Alcock.
,, F. Cusson.
,, B. Peake.
,, S. King.
,, R. Allison.
,, E. W. Derby.
,, E. W. Thurston.

(Being all the members, eleven, present at the meeting.)

Two young men left the parish this week for Canada.

Six of the brothers of the chairman emigrated to Canada.

Appendix 3 to the Report of the Select Committee on the Housing of the Working Classes Acts Amendment Bill shows that out of sixty replies received to inquiries addressed to rural and urban district councils as to the causes of scarcity of cottages in their districts, thirty-seven complain of the difficulty of getting land, the land is either unobtainable or the price put upon it is prohibitive. The last Report of the Medical Officer of Health to the Surrey County Council mentions that a proposal to adopt Part III. of the Housing of the Working Classes Act was negatived chiefly on the ground that no suitable land was obtainable at a sufficiently reasonable price. The hon. Member will also find some instructive evidence in the Reports of Mr. Wilson Fox, C.B., to the Royal Commission on Labour, as well as in Mr. Fox's book on agricultural wages during the last fifty years.

Street Ambulances for London.

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Departmental Committee appointed last year to consider and report upon the question of the provision of ambulances for street accidents in London has finished its inquiry; and when its Report will be published.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am not in a position at present to say when the inquiry will be completed and the Report issued.

Claims for Indian Lawyers for Judgeship.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): To ask the Secretary of State for India, if it is intended to appoint a sixth puisne judge to His Majesty's High Court at Madras; and whether, in view of the fact that the requirements of the statute have been complied with as regards the number of English barrister judges and judges drawn from the ranks of the Indian Civil

Service, and seeing also that only one Indian is a member of the court as at at present constituted, the claims of Indian lawyers will be considered when the appointment is made.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The appointment of a sixth puisne judge to the Madras High Court has been sanctioned. The statute requires not less than one-third of the judges to be barristers and not less than one-third to be members of the Civil Service. When the number of judges was six, it was necessary to appoint not less than two barristers and two civilians. Now that the number has been increased to seven the requirements of the Law can only be fulfilled by the appointment of three barristers and three civilians. An Indian lawyer has been appointed Advocate General.

Army List and Colonial Militia and Volunteers.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War if, having regard to the importance of imparting to the auxiliary forces of all His Majesty's Dominions beyond the Seas a feeling that they form part and parcel of the Imperial Army, it will be possible to arrange for the inclusion of the several recognised corps, their location, and the names of their officers in an annual Army List.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) If the hon. and gallant Member will kindly refer to pages 1821 to 1903 of the Quarterly Army List he will find the desired information concerning the Colonial Militia and Volunteers.

Small Bore Bullets.

Mr. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any recent inquiry has taken place as to the relative efficiency of small-bore bullets of various shapes and patterns with regard to muzzle velocity, low trajectory, and stopping power; and whether the result of such inquiry is available to the public.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The question is under investigation, and it is not yet possible to say whether the results of the investigation, when available, can be published.

Conversion of Lee-Enfield Rifles for use of Auxiliary Forces.

Mr. COURTHOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the conversion of Lee-Enfield rifles for the use of the auxiliary forces has yet commenced; when it is expected to be completed; what sum is placed for this purpose in the Estimates for 1907–8, how many rifles can be converted for this sum; and how many will still remain to be converted at the end of the present financial year.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The conversion of the Lee-Enfield rifles for the use of the auxiliary forces will be commenced this year. The date of completion will depend on the number of rifles required for the Territorial Army. The sum taken in Estimates is £29,800, for which 44,000 rifles can be converted. The numbers remaining for conversion at the end of the year will depend upon the number required for the Territorial Army.

The Albert Hall Dinner to Colonial Premiers—The King's Colonial Guard of Honour.

Dr. HAZEL (West Bromwich): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that a detachment of His Majesty's auxiliary forces attended in uniform and under arms at an entertainment organised by a party political club at the Albert Hall, London, on Thursday, 18th April; whether he gave his permission for their attendance; if not, by whose permission they were present; and whether he proposes to take any further steps to prevent His Majesty's forces from being thus identified with party political organisations.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The application of the guard of honour furnished by the King's Colonial Imperial Yeomanry at the Albert Hall banquet was sanctioned by the General Officer Commanding, London District, in accordance with Paragraph 12, Imperial Yeomanry Regulations. I do not consider that the corps in question identified itself with any party political organisation. A unit composed of representatives of British Colonies throughout the world and incorporated in a regiment of His Majesty's auxiliary forces would appear to be an appropriate body to do honour to our Imperial guests at an entertainment that was not organised for party or political purposes.

Sale of War Department Land at Bexhill.

MR. COURTHOPE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the question of the sale of War Department land at Bexhill to the Bexhill Corporation is still under consideration; and how soon a decision on this question may be expected.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane*). The matter is still under consideration, and it is not possible to say when a decision may be expected.

Cost per man of Horse and Field Artillery under the New Scheme.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Farnham): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he will explain his estimate that the average annual cost per man of the horse and field artillery will be only £45 12s. under his new scheme, as compared with £74 7s. 4d. under the old system; and to what causes does he attribute the corresponding savings of £8 16s. 8d. per man and £6 0s. 6d. per man in the cases of the infantry and cavalry of the line respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane*). The figures given in my reply to a Question put by my hon. friend the Member for the Reigate Division of Surrey on the 11th inst.,† for both the present and the new systems, represent the average annual cost of all those who, on a general mobilisation, would be liable to serve abroad. For the present system these comprise the regular peace establishment and the Army Reserve. For the new system they include in addition the special contingent and the special service section of the territorial force. The reduction in annual cost under horse and field artillery is due partly to the larger Army Reserve to be obtained by a shorter period of colour service for part of the regular establishment of that arm, and partly to the inclusion of the special contingent men for ammunition columns; the cost per head of these men being much less than that of the regular soldier. The corresponding savings under infantry and cavalry of the line are similarly due to the inclusion, under the new scheme, of infantry of the special contingent and cavalry (Yeomanry) of the special service section respectively.

Salaries of Irish Dispensary Doctors.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what was the total amount of salaries paid in each county in Ireland to dispensary doctors in the year 1897; the credit given each county in respect of those salaries in fixing the amount of the Agricultural Grant; the total amount of salaries paid in the year 1906 and the additional contributions towards those salaries from sources other than the Agricultural Grant or local rates; and the total for each county of credits in respect of Agricultural Grant and other contributions.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The total amount of the salaries of dispensary medical officers in the year 1897 came to £90,727, of which one-half was recouped from the Parliamentary Grant. In arriving at the amount which should be allowed for the Agricultural Grant in respect of union charges, account was taken of the amounts actually raised as poor rate by boards of guardians in the standard year, regard being had to any exceptional circumstances which may have caused a variation from the average in accordance with section 49 (1) of The Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898. Special account was not, however, taken of any individual item, and it would not be possible to state with accuracy the actual credit given to each county in respect of the salaries of dispensary medical officers. In the year ended March, 1906, the salaries of the medical officers, together with the payments for services of temporary medical officers, came to £110,134, of which it may be taken that somewhat less than one-half was recouped from the Local Taxation Account. The exact amount of recoupment cannot be given owing to the limitation imposed by Section 6 (1) of the Local Goverment Act of 1902. The salaries of medical officers are paid according to unions, and the unions are not in all cases co-terminous with the counties. The present number of unions extending beyond county limits is forty-six, but there were more than this number in 1897, and no sectional valuations are available for the purpose in that year, so that a comparative statement could not be arrived at, which is presumably what the hon. Member desires.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 346.

Religion of Royal Irish Constabulary stationed at Tipperary.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether all the members of the Royal Irish Constabulary now stationed in county Tipperary are Roman Catholics; and, if so, will steps be taken, and when, to have some Protestants stationed in this county.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) According to the latest statistics the Royal Irish Constabulary in county Tipperary consists of 388 Roman Catholics and sixty Protestants.

Dublin Metropolitan Police—Proportion of Roman Catholics and Protestants.

Mr. SLOAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that there are in all ranks of the Dublin Metropolitan Police Force 995 Roman Catholics and only 195 Protestants, including thirty-four Presbyterians and seven Methodists, he will recommend the advisability to cease re cruiting Roman Catholics until a reasonable proportion of Protestants are taken on; and, if not, can any reason be assigned for not doing so.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Chief Commissioner of the Dublin Metropolitan Police informs me that, in recruiting for the force, no preference is given to men of any particular relgiious belief. The comparative paucity of Protestants is simply due to the fact that few candidates other than Roman Catholics present themselves. It is neither possible nor desirable to make any change in the method of recruiting.

Conduct of Sergeant Cox, Dublin Metropolitan Police.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if an inquiry was recently held into the conduct of Sergeant Cox, of the B. Division of the Dublin Metropolitan Police; whether as the result of this inquiry summonses issued on his report were withdrawn; whether these summonses were withdrawn owing to the contradictory nature of the reports made by Sergeant Cox and the sergeant in charge of the police station; and, if so, will he state whether Sergeant Cox was reprimanded or punished in any way.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Chief Commissioner informs me that no recent inquiry has been held in this matter. In December last Sergeant Cox reported a breach of the Licensing Laws by a publican, and a summons was ordered. It subsequently transpired that there was a difference in the recollection of Sergeant Cox and another policeman as to the precise words used by the publican's foreman, and, as this raised a doubt on a vital point, the publican was given the benefit of the doubt and the summons was not proceeded with. Sergeant Cox's veracity and conduct were in no way impugned, and he was not punished or reprimanded.

Judicial Rent of Mrs. Dolan, of Carrickcrevagh.

Mr. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an appeal has been lodged against the judicial rent fixed on the holding of Mrs. Dolan, Carrickcrevagh, tenant on the Tottenham estate, county Leitrim, although Mrs. Dolan has signed a purchase agreement and paid interest on the purchase money agreed on, and although about twenty years have elapsed since the judicial rent was fixed, and what action does the Land Commission purpose taking with regard to this appeal.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Land Commission inform me that the appeal referred to was twice listed for hearing, but owing to the death of the tenant the case was adjourned. Recently the case appeared in the list for the third time, but as it was stated that proceedings for purchase were pending the court made an order striking the case out of the list of pending appeals, with liberty to re-enter if the purchase should not be carried out.

Irish Education Expenditure.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what sum derived from Irish sources is raised and expended per head of the Irish population on public education in Ireland, in addition to the 6s. 7¼d. annually spent per head of the population which is drawn from Votes of Parliament and the Consolidated Fund.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am not in possession of figures which would enable me to answer this Question, but I would refer the noble Lord to the Answer I gave on the 16th instant to the Question of the hon. Member for Darlington.†

Abolition of Slavery in Zanzibar.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can inform the House of the nature of the contents of the despatch addressed in January to the Acting Commissioner in East Africa on the immediate abolition of the legal *status* of slavery in the Zanzibar Coast Strip, and the abolition of slavery in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba; and can he state why it was thought necessary to ask the Acting Commissioner in Mombasa for further proposals as to arrangements to be made, although the Commissioner himself was in attendance at the Colonial Office.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) In the despatch referred to the Secretary of State stated that, in his opinion, the time had come to abolish the legal *status* of slavery in the mainland dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar, and asked for a report on the most convenient measures to be taken to carry the decision into effect. He added that the matter should be proceeded with as expeditiously as possible. The Acting Commissioner was also requested to consider the question of abolishing slavery altogether within a limited period, and it was added that similar measures to those which might be approved for the mainland would be taken for the abolition of slavery in the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba. The reason why the Acting Commissioner was consulted as to the arrangements to be made was that it was at that time hoped that the arrangements could be put into force before the Commissioner returned, so that the responsibility for carrying them out would fall upon the Acting Commissioner.

Greenwich Hospital Pensions—Case of Daniel Symes.

MR. RENDALL (Gloucestershire, Thornbury): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that Daniel Symes, who entered the Navy on the 22nd March, 1855, after service therein served for five years in the Naval Reserve; whether he is aware that Symes was discharged with a character marked very good; that he is now seventy-three, still trying to do the little labourer's work of which he is capable, and has no children who can render him help; and if he can see his way to grant to Symes a Greenwich Hospital pension under the circumstances.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Although Daniel Symes is eligible for consideration for the award of a Greenwich Hospital special pension, it has been decided that, having regard to his very short service (two years and fifty-five days), after which he was discharged to the shore at his own request, the grant to him of a special pension would not be justified, in view of the numerous superior claims on the funds of the charity.

Shortage of Naval Stokers.

MR. NIELD: To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the deficiency in the number of stokers needed for adequately manning the fleet; and when such deficiency may be expected to be made good.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) There is no shortage of stokers at present. During the current financial year an increase of 1,500 stokers is being allowed for to meet increased requirements, but the rate of recruiting will suffice to produce this number in addition to making good the normal waste.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 778.

Political Influence and Civil Service Promotion.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the Exchequer and Audit Department have recently issued an order drawing the special attention of subordinates in the Department to Article 10 of the Exchequer and Audit Department Office Rules of 1895, to the effect that the use of political influence for the purpose of advancing claims to promotion or increase of salary will be considered in the gravest light; whether he will state the total length of service of the present Assistant Comptroller, and the number of years he has served in each of the positions occupied by him in the different Government Departments, including the Exchequer and Audit Department; and, seeing that the position of Assistant Comptroller is a political appointment, will he explain why Article 10 is in force in the Exchequer and Audit Department, and the reason for recently circulating an order drawing attention to it.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The rule in question is based upon a Treasury Minute, and is, I believe, of universal application throughout the Civil Service. Attention is drawn to it whenever it appears desirable to do so.

Memorial of Customs Assistant Clerks.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he has now investigated the allegation of breach of faith contained in a memorial, dated January 7th last, addressed to the Treasury by the new class of assistant clerks in the Statistical Office of the Customs; and, if so, what action he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The petition is still under consideration.

Poor Law Children.

MR. L. HASLAM (Monmouth Boroughs): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the number of Poor Law children who are entirely dependent on the rates.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The total number of children who are entirely dependent on Poor Law relief cannot be stated. To a very large extent children are relieved with their parents, who are not necessarily entirely dependent on the relief given them. I may, however, state that the number of children in England and Wales in receipt of relief on 1st January last was 234,000. If from this total the children who had a parent living, and who received only some form of out-relief, are deducted, the number left is 71,641. Over 60,000 of them received indoor relief.

Applicants for Poor Law Relief—Production of Marriage Certificate.

MR. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the case papers which applicants for relief, medical or otherwise, are required to furnish, include in the case of married applicants the production of a marriage certificate; and, if not, why they are insisted on by the boards of guardians in Kensington and Bethnal Green.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Applicants for relief are not required to furnish case papers. These papers are filled up by the relieving officer from the statements made to him. The case paper in use at Kensington shows if the relieving officer has inspected the marriage certificate, but I understand that relief is not refused on the ground of its non-production. In the case of Bethnal Green, no applicant for relief is required to furnish a marriage certificate. I am informed, however, that persons in receipt of relief there are asked to state approximately the date and place of marriage. Information as to whether the applicant is married or not is found useful by the guardians for the purposes of their administration.

Supply of Stimulant to Prisoner at Newtownards.

MR. SLOAN: To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether he is aware that a woman named Macauley who was tried on the 28th ultimo for larceny at Newtownards, county Down, was supplied during the nights she was in the barracks with whiskey; and if he will cause inquiry to be made as to why liquor was given to this woman under such circumstances.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed by the police that it is not the fact that this woman was supplied with whiskey during the nights she was in custody. At mid-day on 21st March, she became faint when about to be taken before the court, and the police allowed her to send for a small quantity of whiskey as a restorative. The magistrates were subsequently informed of the fact, and they commended the conduct of the police.

Aliens Naturalised—Suggested Reduction of Fees.

Mr. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will state the number of aliens who have been naturalised in this country during the last year, and the amount received by way of fees for such naturalisation; whether he has been asked to reduce the fee; and, if so, what reply has been made to this request.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) 851 certificates of naturalisation (including 155 to seamen) were granted in the year 1906. The fees received in that year in respect of naturalisation amounted to £3,470. With regard to the amount of the fee and the question of reducing it, I can add nothing to the statement I made in answer to the hon. Member for North Salford, on 28th February last. A copy of his Question and of my Answer is appended.

"Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department has his attention been drawn to the increasing settlement of Jewish inhabitants in Manchester, Salford, and other large towns of the Kingdom, is he aware that many of them desire naturalisation in this country, but are precluded from obtaining it by the fees they are called upon to pay; and will he explain why these fees are maintained at a prohibitive figure.

"(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The fee for the grant of a certificate of naturalisation has for the last twenty years been £5. The number of certificates granted every year is considerable, varying in the last five years from 686 to 978, and there is every year in addition a certain number of refusals. The average number of grants for the five years 1892–6 was 494, and for the five years 1902–6 was 850, an increase of about 70 per cent. It should be remembered that an alien must live for five years in this country before he can be naturalised, and if the saving of £5 during that period presents any difficulty, that difficulty is greatly lessened by the existence of a number of agencies which enable him to accumulate the sum on payment of very small weekly subscriptions."

Accident on Steamship "Hyson" at Liverpool.

Mr. C. DUNCAN (Barrow-in-Furness): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the death of a workman named Meakin on board the steamship "Hyson," at Liverpool, on 9th April last, by becoming entangled in the machinery of the vessel's winch owing to the place being obscured by steam escaping from the cylinders of the winch and the inexperience of the boy in charge of same; if so, has any breach of the dock regulations been committed, and what steps are being taken to enforce such regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have received a Report with regard to this accident. No breach of Regulation 14, relating to exhaust steam, or of Regulation 16, fixing the age below which persons may be employed as winch drivers, appears to have been committed. The escape of steam that occurred in this case was due apparently to the blowing out of the packing of the glands. The immediate cause of the accident was the catching of the clothes of the deceased in the shafts of the winch. It has not been the custom I understand to fence this part of the winch, which has not hitherto been regarded as dangerous, and the inspector states that no accident of the kind has occurred previously during the eighteen months he has been in the district. I am, however, causing inquiry to be made as to whether it would be practicable to do so. I have already stated in reply to Questions in the House the steps which I have taken to strengthen the inspection of docks; in particular, the staff of the Liverpool district, where the accident occurred, has been increased by an additional inspector's assistant.

Payment of Instalments of Guaranteed Land Stock.

Mr. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Treasury is prepared to receive payment of the instalments under the Land Purchase

(Ireland) Act, 1891, in Guaranteed Land Stock, as provided by Section 2 of that Act; whether such payments can now be made at any post offices in Ireland, and will he publish or lay upon the Table of the House the regulations of the Treasury in regard to such mode of payment.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) I would refer the hon. Member to the reply given him on the 22nd instant upon this subject by my right hon. friend the Postmaster General.†

Pensions of Widows of Indian Officers Resident in England and India.

Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the widows of Indian officers who reside in England receive from military funds an annual pension of £250 6s. 4d., while such widows as elect to reside in India receive in rupees the equivalent of only £152 8s. 10d.; and, if so, whether he will explain the reason for such difference.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The widow of a subscriber to the Bengal Military Fund ranking as a lieutenant-colonel receives £250 6s. 4d. a year when resident in England, and Rs. 190.11.6 a month (which, at the present rate of exchange is the equivalent of £152 11s. 6d. a year in sterling) when resident in India. These rates were fixed by the subscribers to the fund many years ago, when it was managed by their representatives, and I see no sufficient reason, as at present advised, for diminishing the one rate or increasing the other.

Women on Local Bodies.

Sir W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the Prime Minister whether he can state when the Bill to enable women to sit on local bodies, referred to in the gracious Speech from the Throne, is likely to be introduced.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman*): I cannot as yet name a date for the introduction of this Bill.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Channel Fleet Cruise.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Channel fleet is to visit Kingstown early in May; and whether a visit will also be paid to Bangor, county Down.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee): The "Hibernia" and three other vessels of the Channel fleet will visit Kingstown on the 2nd May, but no arrangements have been made for a visit to Bangor. I may, however, add that the Atlantic fleet will visit Irish ports later in the summer, but the programme has not yet been definitely arranged.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: I hope the northern town will not be left out.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The programme has not been definitely arranged, but the matter will not be lost sight of.

Battleship Gun Reserves.

Mr. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether a reserve of 10-inch and 7·5-inch guns was included in the purchase from the Chilian Government of the battleships "Swiftsure" and "Triumph;" and, if not, whether a reserve of both classes of gun has since been provided.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No reserve guns were included in the purchase. A reserve of both classes of gun has since been provided.

The Home Fleet.

Mr. NIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the armoured ships constituting the Portsmouth and Devonport divisions of the Home fleet with nucleus crews, whose length of service will not be a fixed period, will practice fire control and carry out gunlayers' tests and battle practice; and whether the annual allowance of ammunition for target practice for ships in the Home fleet will be in the same proportion as that for ships of the Channel, Atlantic, and Mediterranean fleets.

---

† See (4) *Debates,* clxxii., 1432.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative, and to the latter part in the negative.

Rosyth.

Mr. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty if he will state the numbers and grades of the present staff of the Works Department employed at Rosyth.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The staff at Rosyth consist of the following—one superintending engineer; one civil engineer; one assistant civil engineer; two draughtsmen; one accountant clerk. These officers also supervise coast guard works in Scotland.

The Colonies and Deaf Mutes.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can give the names of the Colonial Governments who prohibit the landing of deaf mutes from the United Kingdom, and the reason given for such restrictions on this class of British subjects.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.): I am not aware of any Colony which prohibits the landing of deaf mutes from the United Kingdom, although powers appear to exist in all Colonies possessing responsible government and in other Colonies also to prevent such persons from landing if likely to become a charge upon public funds.

Slavery on the Zanzibar Mainland.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can make a definite and detailed statement in regard to the abolition of the legal *status* of slavery in the Zanzibar coast strip.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Lord Elgin wrote to the Acting Commissioner of the East Africa Protectorate on the 7th January last, saying that in his opinion the time had come to abolish the legal *status* of slavery in the mainland dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar and asking for a Report as to the most convenient measures to be taken to carry this decision into effect. He added that the matter should be proceeded with as expeditiously as possible. He has now learnt by telegraph that a full Report embodying the recommendations of the local authorities will shortly be despatched, and I hope to be able to make such a statement as the hon. Member desires in the course of the next few weeks. The local authorities are aware of the importance which His Majesty's Government attach to the early settlement of this question, and I hope there will be no unnecessary delay.

Australian Tariffs

Mr. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the statement made by a firm of importers of Melbourne, to the effect that the new Commerce Act is being used by the Australian Customs authorities in such a manner as to give a preference to foreign goods; whether, as alleged, goods imported from England by that firm have been arbitrarily declared liable to duty on prices much in excess of those actually charged to the importer; and, if so, whether such action has been so far directed exclusively against goods of British manufacture; and, if an arrangement exists between the Australian Customs authorities and certain American firms by which the goods of the latter are admitted to the Colony under a secret schedule at prices mutually agreed upon to the disadvantage of British manufacturers, will he take steps to bring these concrete instances of Colonial preference to the notice of the Colonial Conference which is now sitting.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I have not seen any statements of the kind referred to by the hon. Member, but I will communicate with the Australian Minister for Trade and Customs, who is now in this country.

New Hebrides Convention.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that, after the signing of the New Hebrides Convention, Australian shippers engaged in the island trade immediately at the request of the Imperial authorities observed its commercial restrictions, and that as a consequence French and German vessels have absorbed the trade in firearms and spirits, to the detriment of British trade generally; and whether he will take steps to obtain the immediate proclamation of the Convention, or the prohibition of the traffic in arms and spirits by France.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Mr. Runciman, Dewsbury; for Sir Edward Grey): Representations have been made to the French Government with a view to the suppression of the traffic in arms and spirits in the New Hebrides. These representations are receiving the careful consideration of the French authorities, but my right hon. friend has not yet received their reply. Some time must of necessity elapse before the proclamation of the Convention can take place.

The Hague Conference.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the delegates representing Great Britain at the Hague Conference have any power to bind this country in respect of the size or character of its armaments.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: My right hon. friend is not at present in a position to add anything to the reply returned to a similar Question put by the hon, Member on March 13th last, to the effect that he could not say anything yet about the instructions to be given to the delegates.

Paddington Borough Council.

Dr. COOPER (Bermondsey, Southwark): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the Borough Council of Paddington has refused to take the legal proceeding advised by its Public Health Committee against local traders who had failed to supply the names and addresses of home workers in their service; and whether the Local Government Board has power to take legal action.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.): I beg to answer this Question on behalf of my right hon. friend. I am in communication with the borough council in regard to the matter referred to in the Question, and shall be happy in due course to inform my hon. friend of the result.

Imports of Arms and Ammunition.

Mr. MOND (Chester): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state what proportion of the imports of arms and ammunition for the year 1905, Cd. 3092, page 124, Class N, were military or naval stores.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs): Military and naval stores are not separately distinguished from other arms and ammunition imported, nor is there a complete account of the imports of such stores, as military and naval stores brought into the country on Government vessels are not recorded in the import Returns. My hon. friend will find some details as to the nature of the articles included under this heading in Vol. I. of the "Annual Statement of Trade."

Classification of Imports.

Mr. MOND: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that Class N, page 124, [Cd. 3092], contains such articles as linseed cake, cotton-seed cake, and paraffin wax; and whether he can see his way to have such items transferred to Class 2, namely, raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured.

I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the classification on page 123, [Cd. 3092], Class 3, Sub-section J; and whether, in view of the fact that this class contains articles like brimstone, saltpetre, opium, indigo, dyewoods, and similar products which are mainly unmanufactured and the raw materials for industries in the United Kingdom, he can see his way to have these articles transferred to Class 2, namely, raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured.

I beg further to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been directed to the fact that in the classification of imports, on page 119 of [Cd. 3092], Class B, practically the entire imports of metals, namely, in an unmanufactured condition, such as tin in blocks, ingots, etc., pig lead, zinc, crude, etc., are included as articles wholly or mainly manufactured; and whether, in view of the fact that these articles are practically unmanufactured and form the raw material of industries in this country, he can see his way in future to have them included in Class 2 of articles mainly unmanufactured.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I will answer all these three questions together. The division between raw materials and manufactured articles must necessarily be of a somewhat arbitrary character and only a small proportion of the articles classed as "wholly or mainly manufactured" represents articles completely manufactured and ready for the consumer. The existing classification is the result of considerable discussion between the Board of Trade and the Customs, and was only brought into operation at the beginning of 1903. The principles on which it is based and the difficulties of classification were fully explained in Cd. 2337 of 1904. The point of greatest importance is to preserve continuity for purposes of comparison. I am accordingly not prepared to alter the system at present, as any advantage gained would not compensate for the confusion introduced by constant changes of classification.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.) asked whether for statistical purposes the right hon. Gentleman would be prepared to institute a new column showing imports which were used for giving employment to the working classes.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I do not think it desirable to disturb the present arrangement. Any change should be a general one and it should be an alteration which would remain in force some years or else the returns would be valueless for the purposes of comparison.

MR. MYER: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that an enormous quantity of semi-manufactured material comes into this question and it is very important to have more details?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That Question has been answered already.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.) drew the right hon. Gentleman's attention to the system of classification adopted in the United States.

Foreign Trusts and the British Meat Trade.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what steps he intends to take to protect the meat trade of the country from the attacks of a foreign trust, and to prevent meat unfit for food being marketed here by the representatives of the meat packers of the United States.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I would remind the hon. Member that my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board has already introduced a Bill providing for the making of regulations in respect of the importation, preparation, storage and distribution of articles of food in the interest of public health. I am not aware that there is a case for any further action at the present time, but the matter is being carefully watched.

The Wreck of the "Jebba."

MR. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fact that, in the recent operations in connection with the saving of the passengers and crew of the wrecked steamship "Jebba," the awards of the Board of Trade were apportioned in amounts of £15 10s. each for the ten coastguards whose good work in saving thirty-eight lives is recognised, while the rewards to the fishermen who saved 117 lives at the peril of their own amounted to £1 each, and in the case of Henry Hurrel to nothing; and whether, in view of the help rendered by these fishermen, some further recompense may be forthcoming.

I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Trade in view of the fact that Isaac Jarvis and John Argent, in connection with the wreck of the s.s. "Jebba," descended a precipitous cliff at the risk of their lives and threw a line on board, and, having thus effected communication with the ship, hauled a number of passengers ashore in a boatswain's chair, whether he will consider the advisability of awarding them recompense more nearly equal to that of the coastguards, who worked the rocket apparatus and received £15 10s., than the sum of £1 which the two men named received.

I beg further to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the services rendered by Mr. W. J. Day, His Majesty's Customs Officer at Salcombe, in the rescue work at the wreck of the steamship "Jebba;" and whether any reward has been or will be granted to him.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I propose to include in my reply the three Questions the hon. Member has on the paper with regard to the wreck of the "Jebba." Since the awards for services rendered at the wreck were announced, fresh information has reached the Board of Trade, and the matter is receiving careful reconsideration. I will inform the hon. Member of the result in the course of the next few days. I hope something may be done in the direction he wishes.

Irish Lights Board.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the action of the Local Government Board auditor in disallowing a small expenditure by the guardians of the South Dublin Union for luncheons, he will apply a similar principle to Boards nominated by Government, such as the Irish Lights Board; and whether he can state the cost for the last financial year of the weekly luncheons of the Irish Lights Board, distinguishing the same from the expenditure for refreshments for the sub-committee making the annual sail of inspection around Ireland.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The Irish Lights Board is not nominated by the Government, but is a statutory body. Their expenditure, which is defrayed out of the General Lighthouse Fund, requires the sanction of the Board of Trade. The cost of their weekly luncheons for the last financial year was £225 6s. 4d. and that of the refreshments of their Inspection Committee £174 3s. 5d. These amounts are charged against the annual sum—limited to £400—which is allowed by the Board of Trade to meet the housekeeping expenses of the Commissioners. The Commissioners do a large amount of public work without remuneration, and I am not disposed to interfere with their luncheons which, as the hon. Member is doubtless aware, are usually provided at the public expense for members of Royal Commissions and similar bodies.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman tell me the value of the wine stock in the cellars of the Irish Lights Board?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: There is an inquiry going on at the present moment.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Are the members of this Board teetotalers?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I must allow the hon. Member to draw his own inference from the figures I have given.

Housing of the Working Classes.

*MR. REES: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether it is proposed to accept the recommendation of the Select Committee on the Housing of the Working Classes Acts Amendment Bill to transfer the administration of the Public Health and Housing Law from the rural district councils to the county councils; if so, whether he is aware that the withdrawal of such functions from such rural district councils is regarded as a retrograde measure, opposed to the principles of local self-government; and whether he will call for Reports from rural district councils before acting upon such recommendation.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): The recommendation of the Committee is of course receiving my consideration in connection with the Bill I propose to introduce in relation to the Housing of the Working Classes, but pending the introduction of the Bill, I cannot give any intimation of the course I think should be taken with regard to this matter. I may, however, state that a considerable number of rural district councils have made representations to me against the recommendation, and that the Executive Committee of the Rural District Councils Association are collecting information from the rural councils, some of which they have already laid before me.

*MR. REES: In drafting his Bill will the right hon. Gentleman consider whether the transfer should not be made contingent on the efficiency or inefficiency of the rural district council in each case.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I will consider that suggestion.

Halsall Charity.

SIR G. KEKEWICH (Exeter): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the trustees of the Halsall Charity have applied for a new scheme for the management of the charity; whether the Board have prepared such a scheme; and, if so, when it will be published.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.): The trustees have applied for a new scheme; such a scheme is now in course of preparation by the Board, but I cannot at present fix a date for its publication.

SIR G. KEKEWICH pointed to the delay which had occurred since the application was first made.

MR. LOUGH: No time will be lost in issuing the scheme.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) asked when the trustees submitted their scheme.

MR. LOUGH: I cannot give the exact date without notice.

SIR G. KEKEWICH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, according to a decision of the Charity Commissioners, the endowment of the Halsall Charity is intended for the benefit of the children of the poor of Great Crosby; and, if so, whether the Board of Education will prevent the trustees from applying the income of the charity or the accumulations of capital in their hands to any other purpose.

MR. LOUGH: The Charity Commissioners formerly expressed the opinion that this endowment should be applied so as to confer upon the children of the poor some special educational benefit which they would not otherwise obtain. With this view the Board of Education concur. Pending the establishment of the new scheme, they cannot interfere to prevent the trustees from applying the income or any accumulations of income in their hands in any manner which is justified by the existing trusts.

SIR G. KEKEWICH asked if it was intended to preserve this endowment for the benefit of the poor.

MR. LOUGH replied that he could answer no further Question without notice.

LORD BALCARRES asked whether there was any ground for the allegation that the original intention of the founder of the charity was being ignored.

MR. LOUGH: I must ask for notice.

National Physical Laboratory.

MR. NIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, having regard to the fact that the business carried on by the National Physical Laboratory has developed in directions expressly excluded by the Report of the Treasury Committee of 1898, the Treasury will amend the terms of reference to the Committee recently appointed by deleting the instructions to the Committee to report on what lines any further development of its, the laboratory's, business should proceed, and substitute an instruction to report on what lines any restriction or development of its business should proceed; and, if not, what grounds the Treasury has for limiting the instruction to the Committee to reporting only in the sense of further development.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I think the hon. Member will find that the terms of reference allow the Committee full scope to consider the point suggested in his Question. He has only quoted the concluding words.

Crown Lands.

MR. H. H. MARKS (Kent, Thanet): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether Messrs. Clutton and Messrs. Smiths and Gore have resigned their appointments as Crown receivers of the agricultural land belonging to the Crown, or whether they have been dismissed; and, if so, whether he can state the ground of their dismissal.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): My hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. The engagements of Messrs. Clutton and Messrs. Smiths and Gore as Crown receivers have been terminated so far as concerns the agricultural estates of the Crown, which have been transferred to the management of the President of the Board of Agriculture. The Government's policy of developing the use of this property for small holdings involved such a complete departure from the methods hitherto adopted that my noble friend considered that a change of agents was essential in order to secure that those who would be largely responsible for carrying out this policy should be not only in full sympathy with it, but also should have had some experience of the special kind of work that it involves.

Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Shepherds Bush Property.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under Lyne): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Crewe, as Church Estates Commissioner, whether the lessee of some eight-four acres of land at Shepherds Bush, of which the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are the owners, has successfully applied to the justices for licences to sell beer, wine and spirits thereon; if so, can he say to what extent facilities for obtaining such liquors will be afforded in consequence; whether the lease contained any restrictive or prohibitive covenant with regard to such sale; if so, upon what grounds the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have refrained from prohibiting this sale; if not, upon what grounds this customary clause was omitted; and whether the Commissioners will, if possible, reconsider their decision with a view to preventing such sale from taking place after the current year.

MR. TOMKINSON (Cheshire, Crewe): The Commissioners understand that the licensing justices have granted a provisional licence for the sale of beer, wine and spirits in buildings to be erected on about 126 acres of land at Hammersmith held from the Commissioners for the purposes of an exhibition, as to forty-two acres on a short tenancy only. The licence is for a period of nine months only in the year 1908. It will be for the licensing justices to determine what restrictions they will place upon facilities for sale. The agreements under which the land is held from the Commissioners contained no restriction or prohibition of the sale of wine, beer and spirits, so long as the land is used for exhibition purposes. The Commissioners did not consider it practicable to prohibit any application by the lessee for a licence and would not regard the insertion of a prohibitory clause as customary in lettings for such purposes as proposed. The Commissioners have no power to vary the terms upon which the lettings have been effected. It will rest with the licensing authorities to determine whether a fresh licence shall be granted after the expiration of the temporary licence provisionally approved by them.

Beith Academy, Ayrshire.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that the Beith Academy, Ayrshire, has been deprived of its *status* as an intermediary and secondary school owing to the Report of Mr. A. R. Andrew, chief inspector for the western division of Scotland; whether the regulations permit this to be done; whether the inspector can so order it to be done on his own belief that there is overlapping in this matter as between the Beith Academy and a local endowed private school; and whether inquiries will be made and instructions given to prevent this action in view of the effect upon the working-class population of Beith.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): It is not the case that the Beith Academy, Ayrshire, has been deprived of any *status* as a secondary or intermediate school which it has ever had, and it is accordingly unnecessary to deal with the other points raised in the Question of the hon. Member.

Scottish Appeals to the House of Lords.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been called to the fact that it is proposed to alter the time within which appeals to the House of Lords from the Court of Session may be taken from two years to one year; whether he is aware that even this reduced delay will cause loss and inconvenience to litigants; and whether he will consider the advisability of taking steps to have the time fixed at six months or less, seeing that the time for appeals in Scotland never exceeds twenty-one days.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs): The substantial reduction of the time for appeals to the House of Lords from judgments of the Court of Session has my warmest approval, and I have been for some time and still am in communication on the subject matter of this Question with the Lord Chancellor.

Westmeath Evicted Tenants Inquiry.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will ascertain and state why the inspector recently sent to Westmeath to investigate the claims of evicted tenants did not give any notice to or call upon or make any inquiry regarding Edward Fagan, evicted by Colonel Smythe, of Collinstown, though he drove by Fagan's present residence; and is this Fagan to be included in the promised scheme providing for evicted tenants.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners have received no application from Edward Fagan, and the inspector therefore had no reason for making any inquiry into his case.

Colonel Smythe's Collinstown Estate.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Estates Commissioners have asked Colonel Smythe, of Collinstown, to sell each or all of the seventeen evicted holdings now on his hands untenanted; and has he consented to sell any of them for the purpose of providing for evicted families.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received but seven applications for reinstatement on this estate. In one case the evicted tenant has been restored; in two cases the Commissioners have decided to take no action; one case has been investigated by an inspector but not yet dealt with by the Commissioners; and the three remaining cases have yet to be inquired into.

MR. GINNELL: Can the right hon. Gentleman say how much of the money voted by Parliament is paid to Colonel Smythe for services at the Viceregal Lodge?

MR. BIRRELL: I cannot.

Irish Charitable Foundations.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Endowed Schools Commissioners and the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests for Ireland are the same persons; are all permanent charities and endowments in Ireland now under the control of these bodies; by whom are inspectors appointed over the various properties and institutions; on whose recommendation; what are the qualifications for these inspectorships; how are the inspectors paid, and paid by whom; how is performance of duty vouched; and will he grant, if moved for, a Return of all the charities and endowed institutions now under the control of these two bodies of Commissioners showing the date of foundation or acquisition, name of founder, nature of property, original and present value, annual yield, annual expenditure, and how applied.

MR. BIRRELL: The Answer to this Question is necessarily of considerable length, and it would be more convenient to circulate it with the Votes. With the hon. Member's permission, I will adopt that course.

Barry Estate, Knocknagree, County Cork.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in reference to the Barry estate, Umeraboy, Knocknagree, county Cork, whether the Estates Commissioners are aware that the landlord offered to sell to the tenants at twenty-one and twenty-four years purchase of first and second term rents respectively, which offer they declined, whereupon the landlord a short time subsequently served the tenants which processes and writs of ejectment, and they offered to purchase at a more reasonable price; is he aware that in June, 1906, the then inspector for the Commissioners in that district visited the estate at the instance of the landlord and after inspection raised the proposed purchase terms on five of the tenants considerably above the landlord's price; and, if so, what explanation the Commissioners have to offer to the action of their inspector in thus increasing the difficulty of land purchase on this estate.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are aware that in this case the landlord proposed to sell on terms which the tenants refused to accept. With the consent of the owner, the Commissioners had the property inspected with a view to making an offer to purchase it, provided that the tenants should agree to repurchase at their estimated price. The price as estimated by the Commissioners, including a year's arrear of rent, were in the majority of cases lower than those at which the owner offered to sell, but in some cases were slightly higher. The tenants have so far refused to purchase at the prices which the Commissioners consider fair, but negotiations are still proceeding.

Blacklion Tenancy Dispute.

Mr. COURTHORPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the boycott of Mr. Taylor, of Blacklion, county Cavan, has been resumed, and that he has been informed the boycott will only cease if he makes a payment in money to the representative of the original tenant of his holding; whether he has any official information showing that the Society of the Ancient Order of Hibernians is directly responsible for the boycott; and whether Mr. Crozier, justice of the peace for county Cavan, and Mr. Bracken, petty sessions clerk and postmaster at Blacklion, continue to combine their official duties with participation in these acts of exclusive dealing.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am informed by the police authorities that it is not the fact that the boycotting of Mr. Taylor has been resumed. The suggestion made some time since that Mr. Taylor should give some monetary compensation to the daughter of the evicted tenant is stated to have been made in a friendly spirit by one or two persons. Seeing that there is now no boycotting in the case, the Questions raised in the concluding paragraphs do not arise.

Glenbeigh and Killorglin Evicted Tenants.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the cases of Michael O'Sullivan, of Dooghs, Glenbeigh, and Daniel Murphy, of Dromin, Killorglin, both evicted tenants, have been inquired into by the Board's inspector; whether the persons at present in occupation of their holdings were asked to surrender, and, if so, with what result; and whether, seeing the local feeling aroused by those cases, he will endeavour to have them settled as quickly as possible.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have inquired into both of the cases mentioned. In the case of Michael O'Sullivan the owner of the property has recently died, and the Commissioners are not at present in a position to say whether it will be possible to restore the evicted tenant to his former holding or provide him with another. In the case of Daniel Murphy the Commissioners have ascertained that Murphy was not evicted from the farm but surrendered it, and moreover the farm has since been purchased under the Land Acts by the present occupier who is not willing to give it up. In the circumstances, the Commissioners have decided to take no further action in the case.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the pressure put on the persons now in occupation of the farms to compel them to surrender them?

Mr. BIRRELL. No, I am not, and I do not know that the hon. Member is.

Kerry Evicted Tenants.

Mr. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many applications for reinstatement by evicted tenants in county Kerry have been inquired into by the inspector of the Estates Commission; how many tenants have been reinstated; and whether, in counties such as Kerry where there is comparatively little untenanted land, steps will be taken to secure that evicted tenants shall not be asked to migrate, but in every case each to get back his old homestead.

MR. BIRRELL: The number of applications inquired into in county Kerry is 415, and the number of evicted tenants reinstated up to 4th instant is 80. The Estates Commissioners endeavour to secure the reinstatement of an evicted tenant in his former holding whenever possible.

Estates Commissioners' Inspectors in County Cork.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many inspectors under the Estates Commissioners are now working in the county of Cork; what are the names of the inspectors, and in what union or unions respectively are they carrying on their operations; and what are the reasons which actuate the Commissioners in changing the inspectors from districts with the circumstances of which they have become familiar, in respect to evicted tenants and untenanted land, to other districts with which they are unacquainted.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that seven of their inspectors and four assistant inspectors are at present engaged in county Cork. The Commissioners do not consider it desirable to publish the names of inspectors who may be employed in particular districts. Inspectors are sent from time to time to the districts in which they are most needed and in which the Commissioners think they will at the time be most useful.

MR. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that three inspectors have successively operated in one union, and that the latest one appointed had to begin the work *de novo*? Cannot the Commissioners be induced to retain an inspector in his district until his work is more or less completed?

MR. BIRRELL: I will draw the Commissioners' attention to the matter, but I do not wish to interfere with them unduly.

Waterville Industrial Class.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether the necessary site for the erection of a class room for an industrial class at Waterville, county Kerry, has been secured; and, if so, when will the building be commenced.

MR. BIRRELL: The Congested Districts Board have made arrangements for securing a site for a class room at Waterville, and the legal requirements only remain to be settled. It cannot yet be stated when the building will be commenced.

Agrarian Outrages in King's County.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether in view of the allegations that exceptional malicious injuries are inflicted in King's County, he will inquire whether it is the fact that the injuries, both malicious and accidental, caused by tramps and roving bands of vagrants have been complained of publicly at meetings of the King's County County Council; and whether he will issue instructions to the constabulary to exercise greater vigilance in the repression of this evil, and to be careful not to return injuries to property caused by vagrants as agrarian offences resulting from the propaganda of a Nationalist organisation.

MR. BIRRELL: The police authorities inform me that cases of malicious injury in King's County are not exceptionally numerous or grave. No recent case of injury—malicious or accidental—has been attributed to tramps or vagrants. The police are fully alive to their duties with regard to vagrants, and there are no grounds for apprehending that offences committed by such persons will be regarded as agrarian.

MR. LONSDALE: Are injuries caused by vagrants returned as agrarian offences?

MR. BIRRELL: The police tell me that they take great pains to avoid that.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE: Will the right hon. Gentleman have inquiry made as to the extent of the injuries done to property by roving bands of tramps?

Mr. BIRRELL: Yes, Sir.

Miss Ffrench's Monivea (Galway) Estate.

Mr. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether application has been made to the Estates Commissioners to purchase the estate of Miss Kathleen Ffrench, Monivea, county Galway, and, if so, the date of the application; whether the Estates Commissioners have yet taken any steps in the matter, or when they intend to do so; and whether, before taking any steps, the Estates Commissioners will satisfy themselves that the tenants on the estate are in full possession of the terms of sale and the number of years purchase they will be called upon to pay for their holdings.

Mr. BIRRELL: The documents relating to this estate were received by the Estates Commissioners in July, 1906, and are at present in the hands of an inspector who has been directed to estimate the price which the Commissioners may offer. Before purchasing the estate, the Commissioners will satisfy themselves that at least three-fourths of the tenants are willing to buy at their estimated price.

Frauds on the Irish Cattle Industry.

Mr. A. ROCHE (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that some cattle dealers in England buy English strippers of a very inferior kind and sell them in other parts of the country as Irish, thereby ruining the trade in Irish strippers, and that some imitate the Government brand which is imprinted on all cattle leaving Ireland; and whether the Department of Agriculture will take steps to secure protection for Irish dealers analogous to that afforded by the national trade mark, and the appointment of inspectors to detect fraud.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Department of Agriculture are not aware of the practice referred to. Their attention was recently drawn to a newspaper report of the proceedings at a meeting of the South of Ireland Cattle Trade Association, at which the matter was mentioned; and they are in communication with that Association with the view of obtaining some definite information on the subject. When such information has been received, the Department will be in a position to consider what further action can be taken.

French Estate, North Tipperary.

Mr. HOGAN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if any proceedings for the sale of the French estate, in North Tipperary, are pending; is he aware that the owner of this estate is a Dublin money lender, and that nine tenants in Drinagh, Ballyduff, and Sharrow, all in the parish of Dorha, are being harassed by this man; will he say what terms this landlord has offered; and will he see that the untenanted land on this estate is secured for those tenants on the estate whose holdings are uneconomic.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are unable to identify any proceedings for the sale of this estate as having been instituted before them, and they have no knowledge of the circumstances of the estate.

Mr. HOGAN asked whether the landlord who was in the hands of the Dublin money-lender had not on his lands stock belonging to the tenants, and if protection would be afforded to the tenants against the seizure of it.

Mr. BIRRELL repeated that he knew nothing of the estate.

Knocklong Labourers' Cottage Scheme.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether complaints have been made to the Local Government Board of the unsatisfactory manner in which the representations for labourers' cottages in the Knocklong electoral division of the Kilmallock union have been dealt with by certain members of the district council; has it been alleged on the part of the applicants for these cottages that particular district councillors have, through motives of personal hostility or otherwise, caused the rejection of representations or the alteration of sites to unsuitable places; have any steps been taken to investigate these complaints; and what right of appeal, if any, have the labourers in these cases.

MR. BIRRELL: The reply to the first two parts of the Question is in the affirmative. The Local Government Board have informed the persons who have complained that the Labourers Acts do not require a district council to adhere to the sites which may be suggested in the representations made to them, and that it is open to any labourer who may feel aggrieved by the action of a district council to appear at the inquiry and lay his complaint before the inspector.

Land Purchase in county Wexford.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that about two-thirds of the land of the county Wexford has been sold out, and that most of the agreements have been lodged before 1905; that both landlords and tenants are affected by the inspections not being made, the landlords having to do without their money and the tenants having to pay 4 per cent. and 3½ per cent. instead of 3¼ per cent.; and whether he will say if an inspector could be appointed to Wexford county, and stay there until the present block is removed.

MR. BIRRELL: It is the fact that a considerable part of the land in county Wexford has been sold under the Land Acts. All estates in the county in regard to which purchase agreements were lodged before 1905 have been inspected, and the advances have been made in all such cases except three. Under the regulations the Estates Commissioners deal with estates in order of priority of application, and it would not be practicable, nor indeed would it be fair to other counties, that Wexford cases should be taken out of their proper turn.

Irish University Scheme.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a memorial signed by more than 1,000 of the most representative Catholic laymen of Ireland, and to the subsequent declaration of the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland, offering the most cordial support to the scheme of university education outlined by his predecessor, Mr. Bryce; and whether he will introduce his University Bill at the earliest opportunity during the present session of Parliament.

MR. BIRRELL; I have seen both the memorial and the declaration referred to in the Question. In the present state of the business of the House, I should not be justified in making any statement in reply to the latter part of the Question.

MR. LONSDALE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the University authorities of the United Kingdom have manifested themselves in opposition to Mr. Bryce's view?

MR. BIRRELL: I could name one or two academic authorities who have not communicated with me.

MR. LONSDALE: How many protests have been received against it?

MR. BIRRELL: I have received a good many as to particular aspects.

MR. SLOAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman prepared to adopt the scheme of Mr. Bryce?

MR. BIRRELL: I do not think that is a Question which should be put to me at this juncture. I am anxious to see this Question brought to a successful issue.

MR. KETTLE asked whether these academic authorities were in any way representative of Irish opinion.

MR. BIRRELL was understood to say that they were English and Scottish.

Fay's Cavan and Meath Estates.

MR. SHEEHY (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the estates of Thomas Francis Fay, at Clonmowley, Longwood, county Meath, and in the county of Cavan, have been in the Court of Bankruptcy for the past twenty years; whether the 40th Section of the Land Act of 1896 applies to these estates; and, if so, will he explain why no steps have been taken to apply this section to them; and if he will give directions to have the matter brought before the Courts without further delay.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed that the estate in question has been in the Court of Bankruptcy for the past twenty years. The bankrupt has a life interest only in the estate. The assignees receive the rents and divide the proceeds among the creditors. No proceedings for the sale of the estate have been instituted in the Land Judge's Court, and therefore the 40th Section of the Land Act of 1896 does not apply to the case.

Tongalee Farm Dispute.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in June, 1906, Mr. John Beirne, of Ballinasloe, bought at public auction the interest in the farm at Tongalee, county Roscommon; that shortly afterwards he was called upon by the Kilbride branch of the United Irish League to surrender the farm for distribution among members of the league; that he offered to sell if he were paid £100 above the price he had given for the farm; that on this offer being refused he proceeded to stock the farm; that on 7th November, 1906, his cattle were dispersed by a mob of persons and cruelly beaten; that nine persons concerned in this act were identified by the police and prosecuted at the Sligo winter assizes; that the jury who tried the case disagreed; that they were tried again on 11th March at Roscommon and acquitted, although no evidence was offered for the defence, and Mr. Justice Kenny declared that there was no question of the prisoners' guilt; that on 20th January Mr. Beirne announced his surrender to the United Irish League, and offered to accept from the Estates Commissioners the full value of his land; and whether, having regard to these circumstances, the Estates Commissioners have furnished the funds for the purchase of this property.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed that the facts are substantially as stated in the Question. It was reported to the police that a resolution was passed by a local branch of the United Irish League calling upon Mr. Beirne to surrender the farm for distribution, but the police have no evidence that the resolution was passed. On 2nd February last Mr. Beirne offered the farm for sale to the Estates Commissioners, and has since lodged the necessary documents. The Commissioners have referred the matter to one of their inspectors, and upon the receipt of his Report they will consider the question of purchase in the ordinary course.

Irish Department of Agriculture Inquiry.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the importance of the evidence given in the course of the inquiry into the working of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, and its possible bearing on future legislation, he will arrange for the immediate presentation to the House of the official minutes of evidence taken before the committee of inquiry.

MR. BIRRELL: I cannot see that any useful purpose would be served by the presentation of the evidence without the Report. I have already stated, on the authority of the Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry, that the Report will be presented at the earliest possible moment.

MR. LONSDALE: About when?

MR. BIRRELL: I hope by the end of this month.

Edenderry Union Tenders—Boycott of English Firms.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, when advertising for tenders for the supply of medicines and surgical appliances, the guardians of the Edenderry union stipulated that the envelopes should be marked on the outside from Irish firms; that out of many tenders sent in only four were marked as directed, and only those four were opened and considered; whether this device was resorted to because the guardians had been warned by the Local Government Board that recoupment would not be made in any case where the guardians did not accept the lowest tender received by them; and whether, having regard to the fact that the practice of the Edenderry guardians is being recommended for adoption by other boards with the avowed object of boycotting English firms, the Local Government Board propose taking any action in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: The facts are correctly stated in the first two parts of the Question. The regulations provide that recoupment from the local taxation account will not be allowed in any case in which the guardians accept a tender other than the lowest, without the approval of the Local Government Board. The Board do not consider that the contracts in this case have been entered into in accordance with the regulations, and they intend, therefore, to disallow recoupment to the guardians in respect of the cost of any medicines or appliances obtained under such contracts.

Bagot Estate, County Galway.

MR. JOHN ROCHE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the tenants upon the Bagot estate, Ballygar, county Galway, have signed agreements to purchase their holdings over two years ago; and, in view of the fact that there are about 300 of them under £5 valuation and about 1,200 acres of untenanted land upon the estate, can he state when sale may be completed.

MR. BIRRELL: Proceedings in this case have been somewhat delayed owing to the efforts of the Estates Commissioners to obtain more than the 1,200 acres of untenanted land mentioned, in order to relieve the extensive congestion which prevails on the estate. The Commissioners hope shortly to make a formal offer to the Land Judge for the purchase of the property, but if their offer should be accepted the completion of the sale will necessarily be delayed by the preparation of a scheme for the rearrangement and enlargement of holdings. The estate is an extensive one.

Irish Council Bill.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the promised Bill for the establishment of an Irish Council will be introduced before Whitsuntide; and, if so, on what date.

MR. BIRRELL: The Bill to which the hon. Member refers will be introduced before Whitsuntide, and, subject to possible alteration, I hope to introduce it on Tuesday, the 7th of May.

MR. LONSDALE: Can the right hon. Gentleman give the House an assurance that it will have two days to discuss the introduction of this important Bill?

MR. BIRRELL: I think the experience of the House is that until a Bill is in print and hon. Members have an opportunity of seeing it one day is ample.

Killarney Lake Boats.

MR. SLOAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the Lake of Killarney at the present time boats are used that are not certified as seaworthy, and that the persons in charge are without a licence; and if the recommendation of the Lord-Lieutenant, made in 1903, after a boating accident on the lake, when thirteen lives were lost, namely, that all such boats should be certified, will be carried out.

MR. BIRRELL: The police authorities inform me that all the boats in use on the Lake of Killarney have been certified as seaworthy, and that no single instance of the use of an unseaworthy boat for the conveyance of passengers has come to their knowledge in recent years. The boatowners are not required to be licensed.

Irish Land Purchase Finance.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how much of the £1,635,207 available by the Estates Commissioners on the 16th February last to meet sales under the Irish Land Act of 1903 has been paid out in part settlement of the £31,633,776 estimated as being required to meet sales in hand on that date; whether the balance, if any, is bearing interest; and, if so, what rate.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed that the amount remaining available for advances on 20th instant was estimated to be £371,628. The investment of balances is a matter for the National Debt Commissioners, and I understand that my hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury has answered Questions on the subject within the past day or two.

Captain CRAIG: Can the right hon. Gentleman explain how it is that, with so many estates wanting settlement, so large a balance is retained in hand?

Mr. BIRRELL: I should like notice of that.

Irish Trade Statistics.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the list of Irish exports and imports for the year 1905 is now ready for publication; and can he say when it will be issued, and whether it will contain the various references made to Irish trade by the Consular Reports of that year.

Mr. BIRRELL: It is expected that the Report on Irish exports and imports in 1905 will be ready for presentation to Parliament towards the end of next month. The various references to Irish trade contained in the Consular Reports for that year will be included in an appendix to the Report.

Cooscroum Slip, Kerry.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he now state what action the Congested Districts Board are prepared to take in the matter of the proposed slip at Cooscroum, county Kerry.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Congested Districts Board have again had the matter before them and have determined to adhere to the decision of which I have already informed the hon. Member, namely, that they will not consider the question of works at Cooscroum until it has been decided what, if any, contribution they will have to make for works at Reenard Point.

Evidence on Brand for Irish Cured Fish.

Mr. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland can he state when the evidence taken on the subject of the proposed brand for Irish-cured fish will be published.

Mr. BIRRELL: The evidence is being printed and will be on sale in the course of a week or two.

Irish Land Purchase Delays.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state when the estates for sale which are now actually being dealt with by the Estates Commissioners were lodged; what were the names of the last three estates which went through and the counties where situate; how many estates have been entered for sale since the last estates referred to above were received; and what is the amount of the purchase money which the latter estates represent.

Mr. BIRRELL: Advances are at present being made for the purchase of estates in respect of which the purchase agreements were lodged in February, 1905. The number of estates finally dealt with ranges from ten to twenty each week, and the advances are made according as the cases become ripe, irrespective of the counties in which the estates are situate. Since February, 1905, the Estates Commissioners have received purchase agreements for 2,899 estates, the purchase money of which amounts to £26,091,877.

Labourers Cottage Scheme Appeals.

Mr. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will say, seeing that under Section 6 of the Labourers (Ireland) Act of 1906 the labourers whose representations have been rejected by the district council can be heard, and their claims for cottages and plots be put forward at the inquiry, if their claims as above are favourably entertained and reported on, they will be included in the scheme.

Mr. BIRRELL: Any person whose application for a cottage has been rejected by a district council may appear before the Local Government Board's inspector at the local inquiry and state his complaint. The Labourers Acts do not empower the inspector to authorise the acquisition of land for cottages and plots in excess of the number proposed in the district council's scheme. The inspector would, however, probably report the facts brought forward at the inquiry in regard to representations rejected by the district council, and it would be open to the council to consider the propriety of amending the existing scheme or of including in a separate scheme any additional cases favourably reported on.

Crannagh Farm, Roscommon.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the result of his further inquiries into the state of affairs on the Crannagh farm, county Roscommon; whether he is aware that twelve tenants, under stress of the boycott, have served notice to surrender their holdings; and, seeing that at a meeting held on Easter Sunday it was decided to pursue the campaign of boycotting until the remaining tenants were forced into submission, whether he will state what action he proposes to take.

MR. BIRRELL: The police have been informed that all the tenants of the Crannagh Farm except one have served notice of their intention to surrender their holdings. I have already distinctly informed the hon. Member, on the authority of the local police, that these men have not been boycotted. It seems, however, that strong local feeling was manifested in favour of the division of the farm among neighbouring small occupiers, and the tenants would appear to have been influenced by that feeling. I am aware that a statement to the effect mentioned in the latter part of the Question has appeared in a Dublin newspaper, but the police inform me that no language bearing any such interpretation was used at the meeting referred to. I do not propose to take any special action in the matter. I have already stated that the police will afford full protection to all persons in the exercise of their legal rights.

MR. LONSDALE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that these people have been forced to surrender their farms by the United Irish League?

MR. BIRRELL: No, Sir.

MR. FLAVIN: Was not the spirit which promoted the passing of the Land Act of 1903 based on the understanding that these grass lands should be broken up?

[No Answer was returned.]

Ballina Medical Officer.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what action has been taken by the Local Government Board in regard to the appointment of Dr. Clarke as temporary medical officer to the local dispensary district, having regard to the fact that the Ballina Board of Guardians made it a condition of his appointment that he should use his influence to induce his uncle to relinquish his tenancy on the Crannagh farm.

MR. BIRRELL: The Local Government Board have sanctioned Dr. Clarke's appointment as temporary medical officer of the Ballina dispensary district. No facts came to the knowledge of the Board which would justify them in withholding their sanction.

Ballymoney Labourers' Cottage Scheme.

MR. GLENDINNING (Antrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Alexander Thompson, of Canfinton, Rasharkin, applied for a labourer's cottage about three years ago, and the same was passed by the rural council of Ballymoney and inserted in the scheme, and that the rural council had agreed with the tenant as to the compensation and possession of the lands; and seeing that the Local Government Board and the landlord of the holding have between them blocked the matter, he will grant an inquiry into the reason of the delay why this cottage should not now be erected, while other cottages in the same scheme are being built.

MR. BIRRELL: By a Provisional Order dated 14th July last, the Local Government Board authorised the Ballymoney Rural District Council to acquire a site by agreement for the erection of a labourer's cottage in this case. The Order became absolute on the 2nd September, and since then the matter has been entirely in the hands of the rural district council. It appears from the evidence taken at the local inquiry that the occupier of the site is now the owner of it, and if it be the fact, as stated in the Question, the rural district council have agreed with him as to the compensation to be paid for the site, the council should have no difficulty in acquiring the site and in proceeding with the erection of the cottage.

Sarsfield Estate (Cork) Evicted Tenants.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say what steps have been taken by the Estates Commissioners with a view to the reinstatement of the evicted tenants upon the Sarsfield estate, Carrigane, Carrigtwohill, county Cork; and what is the cause of the delay that has occurred in concluding a settlement.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have made a provisional offer for the purchase of the estate in question, but the owner has so far not accepted it. In the circumstances, the Commissioners are not yet able to deal with the case of the evicted tenants.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this is only a sample case? Will he satisfy himself as to the need for immediate legislation conferring compulsory powers?

MR. BIRRELL: I can assure the hon. Member that this matter is receiving consideration.

Irish Department of Agriculture—Income

MR. J. MACVEAGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the further figures recently published, he can now state precisely the total amount received by the Department of Agriculture since its establishment, from Parliamentary grants, endowment, and all other sources, with the rate per head of the present population, and the total amount expended.

MR. BIRRELL: The total amount received by the Department of Agriculture since its establishment is £2,507,646, including £185,000 paid over to the Congested Districts Board. Excluding the latter sum, the amount is equivalent to an annual rate of 1s. 6d. per head of the present population of Ireland. The unexpended balances of the Parliamentary Vote surrendered to the Exchequer during the seven years amounted to £33,510 approximately. The unexpended balance of the Endowment Fund on 31st ultimo was £383,054, of which £125,124 is earmarked for the purposes specified under Section 15 (*c*) and Section 16 (1) (*a*) to (*f*) of the Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899. The balance has been allocated by the Agricultural Board for agricultural purposes under the terms of Section 16 (*g*) of the same Act. The amount actually expended, excluding the sum paid over to the Congested Districts Board, was £1,916,082.

Dowra (Cavan) Disturbances.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a police report to the effect that Mr. Johnston, of Bawnboy House, when about to visit his property near Dowra, county Cavan, on 19th February last, was met by a crowd with drums and horns and was prevented from proceeding; whether the bench of magistrates at Dowra petty sessions decided that the assembly was unlawful; and why the accused were forthwith discharged.

MR. BIRRELL: The police summoned several persons for unlawful assembly on the occasion referred to in the Question. The case was heard on 10th instant, when the magistrates held that the offence was proved, and that the facts would have justified them in binding the defendants to keep the peace. Having regard, however, to the previous good character of the defendants, and to the fact that there had been no renewal of the disorder, the magistrates did not think it necessary to require bail.

MR. MEYSEY-THOMPSON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in March last a postman was assaulted at this place in the execution of his duty? Will he see that the magistrates do enforce the law?

MR. BIRRELL hoped the magistrates did so in all parts of Ireland.

*MR. VINCENT KENNEDY inquired if Mr. Johnston was deputy-lieutenant of the county, grand master of the Orangemen, and a Poor Law guardian, and if he did not hold several other similar public appointments in the locality; and would the Chief Secretary save him from the pain caused by the suggestion that he was unpopular amongst his supposed friends.

[No Answer was returned.]

Mr. Michael Murphy's Macroom Estate.

MR. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Michael Murphy, J.P., the Demesne, Cloyne, landlord of a property at Inchinasingane, near Macroom, county Cork, has served certain of his tenants with debtors' summonses in the Bankruptcy Court recently for arrears of rent; can he state whether negotiations for the purchase of this estate were proceeding for some time, and that the landlord agreed to leave a settlement of the question to arbitration, but subsequently receded from this agreement; will he say whether it is customary for landlords to use the procedure of the Bankruptcy Courts for the recovery of their rents; and can he give the number of cases in which landlords took proceedings in the Bankruptcy Court against their tenants since the passing of the Land Act of 1903.

MR. BIRRELL: The Registrar of the Cork local Court of Bankrupcy informs me that in February last debtors' summonses at the suit of Mr. Murphy were served on three tenants for sums of £65, £65, and £55 respectively, being the amounts of judgments of the King's Bench Division in respect of which the Sheriff had made a return of no goods. The Registrar informs me that it is not unusual for landlords to take proceedings in the Bankruptcy Court for the recovery of rent, when the ordinary mode of procedure has failed. I have no information of the number of cases in which such proceedings have been taken in the chief and local Courts of Bankruptcy. The question of sale has not come before the Estates Commissioners and they have no knowledge of any negotiations which may have taken place between the landlord and tenant.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this is merely a family dispute and that the tenants referred to are the landlord's brothers?

[No Answer was returned.]

North Antrim Income-tax Appeals.

MR. GLENDINNING: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the Income-Tax Commissioners to hear appeals from assessments in North Antrim sit in Coleraine; if he is aware of the inconvenience it is to North Antrim residents to have to go to Coleraine; and whether he could arrange that a one-day sitting each year should be held in Ballymoney, the most central place for residents in North Antrim.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The special Commissioners state that they were not aware of any North Antrim appellants having hitherto found it inconvenient to attend the place of meeting selected as being nearest to their residences, but they will gladly bear in mind the suggestion that they should hold a one-day sitting at Ballymoney in addition to the sitting to be held at Coleraine.

Irish Land Purchase Acts.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the recent disclosure of losses under the Irish Land Purchase Acts and the consequent dissatisfaction in Ireland, the Treasury will reconsider favourably the suggestion to appoint a small and independent Committee of financial experts, with suitable actuarial assistance, to examine and report upon all the financial methods and practices under those Acts; and, if so, will at least one member be placed upon the Committee in whom the tenant-purchasers will have confidence.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I understand that opportunity is desired for a discussion in this House on the financial working of the Land Purchase Acts. I am not aware of any necessity for the appointment of a Committee of Inquiry.

Irish Land Purchase Fund.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state the maximum amount not bearing interest to the credit of the Irish Land Purchase Fund in the Bank of England at any time since the account was opened; whether any amount, and, if so, the maximum, at any period has been lying in the Bank of Ireland without interest; whether any effort has been made to procure interest from the Bank of England; and whether any negotiations have been carried on with the Irish banks as to the terms that might be procured from them for the use of this money.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The largest balances on the Land Purchase Fund Account occur when considerable sums have been paid up in respect of an issue of stock, which are not immediately required for advances and can only gradually be invested. The maximum balance to the credit of the fund in the Bank of England at any time since the account was opened was £2,385,310 on the 9th April, 1904, which in great part was due to instalments being paid up under discount in respect of the first issue of guaranteed 2¾ per cent. Stock. Of this sum £1,500,000 was invested by the 15th April. The balance at the Bank of Ireland, except to meet the weekly advance to the Irish Land Commissioners, seldom exceeds £1,000. The balances on the accounts of the Commissioners, whether in the Bank of England or in the Bank of Ireland, do not bear interest. No attempt has been made to obtain from the Bank of England an allowance of interest on the balance of this account, as it would be contrary to the rules of the bank. The balance is invested as closely as possible in securities according to Section 34 (2) of the Act. No negotiations such as the hon. Member suggests have been carried on with the Irish Joint Stock Banks.

Mr. HAYDEN: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the banks in Ireland allow the county councils interest upon the credit balances of the current accounts, and will he consider the desirability of directing the attention of the National Debt Commissioners to the system of finance adopted by the county councils in Ireland with the view of having it adopted in this country?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I am quite aware of that. The question of which bank should be dealt with is a very much larger question.

Captain CRAIG: May I ask is it necessary at all to have a single penny lying in any bank? There are £30,000,000 worth of estates waiting to be dealt with.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: Yes, but it must be remembered that you cannot work a large account of this kind without having a balance in the bank to carry on transactions.

Captain CRAIG: Is it not a fact that for three or four months past £30,000,000 of estates has been in the hands of the Estates Commissioners, and might the hon. Gentleman not discover by consultation with the Chief Secretary whether there is any necessity to have any balance at all lying in the bank?

[No Answer was returned.]

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: I would like to ask whether, if the Bank of Ireland allows interest on a current account, why so large an amount was left in the Bank of England?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The hon. Member wishes to know why we did not hold a large balance at the Bank of Ireland. It was due to representations which were made to us from Ireland, and very largely from the benches opposite.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Will the hon. Gentleman explain that Answer? Those representations were a complaint that the Government were dealing solely with the Bank of Ireland, and no other Irish banks. Was there any representation made to use the Bank of England against the Bank of Ireland or any other bank?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The hon. Gentleman will understand that the question was only with reference to the Bank of Ireland.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: The hon. Gentleman's reply was that representations were made from these benches in favour of the account being kept in the Bank of England. There is not a shadow of foundation for that statement.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I said that representations were made about the account being kept in the Bank of Ireland.

MR. LONSDALE: In view of the misunderstanding that seems to exist in the mind of the hon. Gentleman, will he have the amount lying to credit in the Bank of England removed to the Bank of Ireland?

MR. RUNCIMAN: No. There is no misunderstanding in my mind, and no inference may be drawn from the same.

Later:

MR. JOHN REDMOND: On Monday last, when a number of Questions were asked about the breakdown of the financial system of the Land Act, 1903, I asked the Prime Minister whether he would afford us an opportunity for a discussion of the matter, the importance of which he and the House generally quite realised. The right hon. Gentleman was good enough to say that it was a proper matter to be discussed, and suggested that we might discuss it on an Irish Vote. I wish to ask him whether he is aware that the authorities of the House whom I have consulted, say that would be quite out of order to have such a discussion as we contemplated on any of the Votes, whether English or Irish; and whether, in view of this situation and in view of the urgency of the question—for until we have that discussion we cannot properly discuss Irish legislation which has gone upstairs—he can see his way to promise an opportunity for discussing the matter.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): I understand that it is as the hon. Member has said, and that what I suggested the other day cannot be done. I have only heard of it, and have not had time to consider what alternative proposal I can make, but we will at once look into the matter and meet the hon. Member's wishes as far as possible.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): May I ask whether any arrangements can be made to prevent the discussion of the Bill which has gone upstairs beginning until we have had a discussion on the matter which has arisen?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: This has come to me quite without notice. At first blush the suggestion made by the right hon. Gentleman seems reasonable. I understand he suggests that the discussion on the Irish Land Bill in Committee might be prejudiced by the fact that this great question had not been discussed. I confess I agree with that. I do not see how it is possible for us to have a satisfactory discussion in Grand Committee of the proposed Irish Land legislation until we have discussed the new grant question which has arisen. I therefore view with approval the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That is an element in the case which will be considered and looked into.

Westmeath Death Duty Grant.

SIR WALTER NUGENT (Westmeath, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he is aware that a deduction has been made by the Treasury from the amount payable to the Westmeath County Council in respect of the Death Duty Grant for the year ended 31st March, 1907; if he can state the amount of the deduction and on what account it has been deducted; whether the amount deducted is entirely lost to the council; and if such deductions are likely to continue or occur in the future, or if this is merely a temporary deduction of the money, which will be paid to the council at a future date.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The amount deducted in 1907 from the Death Duty Grant of county Westmeath was £2,393 9s. 0d. of which £179 0s. 6d. was the net amount required from the county by the Irish Land Commission towards balancing the Land Purchase Account under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, and £2,214 8s. 6d. represented the net amount chargeable to the county under the Irish Land Act, 1903. This last sum includes £254 in respect of arrears of annuities, and £1,960 on account of the deficiency of the Income Account of the Irish Land Purchase Fund. Approximately, £750 may be taken as a merely temporary deduction, and the balance as in part a final charge on the county, and in part a charge ultimately to be recouped when the final instalments of purchase annuity are paid. For an explanation of the general Question, I would refer the hon. Member to my Answer to the Question of the hon. Member for Waterford on the 22nd April, 1907.†

New York Peace Congress.

*Mr. REES: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Peace Congress recently held in New York had any international basis; whether Great Britain was represented thereat by any authorised agent or agents; and whether the resolutions adopted in respect of the Hague Conference have any authority, other than such as they may derive from the character of those who adopted such resolutions.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The National Arbitration and Peace Congress at New York has no international character, and is understood to be a meeting of private societies interested in the question of settling disputes between countries by arbitration. His Majesty's Ambassador at Washington and His Excellency the Governor-General of Canada were invited to attend the dinner which closed the congress on the 17th instant. As to the latter part of the Question the Answer is in the negative.

Standing Orders and Blocking Motions.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister what progress, if any, has been made with regard to the Standing Order dealing with blocking Bills and Motions.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Government quite realise the importance of this matter and they are giving it their attention, but it is one of those questions which can only finally be settled by general consent of the House. It appears to me, therefore, to be undesirable to be in too great a hurry to arrive at a solution.

London Traffic.

Sir WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if the attention of the Government had been called to the detrimental effect of the competition existing between the transport authorities of the metropolis; and whether, having regard to the probability of private enterprise in transport being unable to compete with transport enterprise carried on on the security of the rates, the Government will, as recommended by the Royal Commission on London Traffic, appoint a traffic board, with power to regulate and supervise the various transport services of the metropolis.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The question of London Traffic is engaging the careful attention of the Government, but I am unable to hold out any hope of legislation during the present session. I must not be understood to admit the suggestion in the hon. Member's Question as to the detrimental effect of the competition to which he refers.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Have any steps been taken to regulate the tearing up of the roads by an enormous number of different authorities?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That is another question.

Mr. BOWERMAN (Deptford): Is it not a fact that the action of the London County Council in providing rapid and cheap transit from the crowded areas into the healthier areas has been the means of reducing lunacy, and thereby conferring a benefit on the community at large?

[No Answer was given.]

Government Valuation Bills.

Mr. WEDGWOOD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Valuation Bills, of which he spoke at the Holborn Restaurant, will provide the basis of rating reform in rural as well as in urban areas and if not, why it is proposed to exclude rural areas from the benefits of this reform.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is unusual to disclose the character of a Bill before its introduction, and my hon. friend will see, I think, that this is a rule which cannot be broken in the present case.

The Land Policy of the Government—The Prime Minister and the Demand for Land.

Mr. LANE-FOX (Yorkshire, W.R., Barkston Ash): I beg to ask the Prime Minister on what official information he has relied in making the statement that in one district after another the demand for land for the purposes of use and labour is met with blank denial; and whether he can lay such information before the House, giving the names of the districts to which he referred.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 1425, *et seq.*

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The hon. Gentleman puts me in a position of some difficulty. If I were to refer him, in detail, to the evidence on which the passage that he selects from my speech was based I might seem to be accusing him of ignorance of the official testimony gathered, sifted, and reported on for the most part by his own political friends. And besides, I should be guilty of making an inordinate demand upon the time of the House on account of the abundance of the testimony. If, on the other hand, I were to give him only general references I might be accused of shirking what appears to be a perfectly sincere demand for information. I think perhaps the best course for me to follow will be this. I have with me a sort of catalogue, extending to the dimensions almost of a pamphlet, of the testimony on which this extract was based, and if an educational purpose would be served I should be glad to circulate it with the Votes.† There are, as no doubt he knows, various Returns and Reports bearing on the subject of small holdings and cottages. There is, for instance, the Report of the Select Committee of 1890 which was presided over by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, and there is the recent Reports of Lord Onslow's Committee and the Select Committee on Rural Housing. But, as I have said, I will endeavour to provide him with samples, so that his researches may be rendered as little arduous as possible. Apart from the official evidence on the subject, it is, I imagine, within the knowledge of every Member of this House who is at all acquainted with rural life, that in very many parts of the country it is impossible to secure either sites for cottages or land for the purpose of small holdings.

Welsh Church Commission.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Welsh Church Commission postponed the sitting intended to have been held on Saturday because of the number of resignations that have occurred among its Members, and what steps, if any, have been taken to fill such vacancies; and whether the Chairman has been kept officially informed from time to time of the tender of resignation by any member or consulted as to the filling up of any vacancy on the Commission.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Chairman of the Commission has been kept fully informed of every step which has been taken by the Government in connection with the recent vacancies which have occurred. The names of Sir David Brynmor Jones, the Rev. J. Morgan Gibbon, and Mr. John Herbert Davies, Registrar of University College, Aberystwith, have been submitted to the King for approval as Members of the Commission.

NEW BILL.

MORTGAGE OF PREMISES BILL.

"To amend the Law in regard to the Mortgaging of Premises containing trade machinery," presented by Mr. Joseph Walton; supported by Sir William Holland, Mr. Crombie, and Mr. Parkes; to be read a second time upon Monday, 24th June, and to be printed. [Bill 167.]

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee).

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

INCOME TAX.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Income Tax shall be charged for the year beginning the 6th day of April, 1907, at the rate of one shilling in the pound."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

*MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) expressed regret that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made no reference to the valuable evidence given before the Income-Tax Committee, which showed very clearly that the incidence of the estate duty now had a very considerable effect in differentiating between earned and unearned incomes. If the right hon. Gentleman was not satisfied with the differentiation which now existed, surely it would be a fair and simple plan, both from the point of view of the Board of Inland Revenue and from that of the taxpayer, to slightly readjust the estate duties. He could not help thinking that the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman would create very great irritation among certain classes of income-tax payers and that the loss the Exchequer would suffer in revenue would be very much more than the right hon. Gentleman anticipated at the present time. Undoubtedly there would be a very serious grievance felt by those people whose incomes were on the border of £2,000 a year. No doubt a great many of them would make perfectly honest returns, but there would be a last proportion who would do one of two things: either they would return the earned portion of their income but not the whole of the unearned portion, so as to bring the total below £2,000; and with the present staff it would be almost impossible for the Inland Revenue Authorities adequately to check the returns; or they would divide a certain portion of their capital among members of their family and thus bring their personal incomes under £2,000. In that manner they would escape the net of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in a perfectly legitimate way. There was another section of income-tax payers who would feel a sore grievance, and those were the men whose incomes were the result of hard work and thrift in early life and who had invested their savings to produce, say, £700 a year. They would feel that they were being penalised on their savings to the extent of 3d. in the £ for the purpose of granting old-age pensions to those who would make no provision for the future, and no doubt many of them would so frame their return as to avoid the tax in a way which had not been done before. Was it not better, instead of penalising the man who had made the savings, to penalise the person who succeeded to them? In his opinion it would be much fairer to everybody, and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had considered more carefully the bearing of the death duties on the question of differentiation he surely would have slightly readjusted their scale rather than have adopted his present proposal. The right hon. Gentleman anticipated a loss of £1,250,000 on the income-tax, and he proposed to make it up by a change in the death duties. People who were not millionaires had little sympathy with those who were, and looked very calmly on any proposal to increase the taxation upon them. But he was very much surprised to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer declare the other day that the predictions made at the time the death duties were instituted had been absolutely falsified, and that no country houses had been shut up in consequence of them. If the right hon. Gentleman took a tour of the country districts he would not find a single county in which some house had not been shut up simply because of the incidence of these duties, or cases where people whose families had lived in the same house for generations had been compelled to let it to strangers, and the servants employed about them had had to be turned adrift. He did not profess to possess expert financial knowledge, and would not therefore offer an opinion as to the extent that capital would be driven out of the country in consequence of the increased duties, but it seemed to him that in inflicting extra penalties on this class of people, they were imposing them on the persons most able to avoid them if they desired to do so. The question of raising death duties should also be examined from another point of view, and that was the bearing it would have on the receipts coming into the Exchequer. Since they had been instituted, many persons, in view of the burden that would be inflicted on their successors, had divided up their estate among their family during their lifetime and thus escaped the duty, and he ventured to think that the result of putting a further burden on the large estates would be to encourage that practice. The consequence of that would be that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would suffer the loss of a very considerable amount of revenue, and he very much doubted that he would be able to come down to the House on introducing his next Budget, and tell them that he had a large sum at his disposal for old-age pensions and so forth. The President of the Board of Education had told them the other day that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had paid off more debt during their condition. And the way in which taxation was laid upon them made them largely unconscious of the fact that they were paying taxes. He was quite sure that if the mass of the people of this country were conscious of the amount they were paying in taxation they would present a demand to the Government, a demand stronger than the appeal to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was open, namely, the piteous cry of the distressed income-tax payer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that there were £20,000,000 of war taxation remaining. He found that of this £20,000,000 of war taxation, £11,000,000 was derived from indirect taxation, and four-fifths, probably ten-elevenths, of that indirect taxation was paid by the working classes, whose average income did not come to 25s. a week. There was no redress in this Budget. The only thing that the Chancellor of the Exchequer offered to them was an indefinite promise of old-age pensions, but at their own expense. It was important to make that point clear. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had a surplus, and of that surplus £1,250,000 was to be devoted to relieving incomes over £160 per annum. The rest of the surplus was paid by poor people through indirect taxation. It was important to emphasise that fact, and the Government might depend upon it that they would use the opportunities they had outside the House to tell the people of the country that the remission of the taxation was on incomes of £40 a week, that the benefit was being given by this social reform Government to that class at the expense of families with incomes of less than £1 a week. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that every class of the community must pay for social reform. But the justification of old-age pensions was that those who were to receive them were too poor during their active life to provide their own old-age pensions. If it were not so, there would be no justification for advocating a scheme of old-age pensions. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, however, proposed to make the working people pay for their own old-age pensions, though the capacity of the mass of the people to bear taxation was less to-day that it had been at any time during the last six or seven years. But what of the capacity of the other class about whom the Chancellor of the Exchequer was so solicitous? He found from the income-tax return that in the first ten years of the twenty years preceding last year the amount of the income brought under review of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, increased by £47,000,000 a year. He found that in the last ten years of the twenty years the increase was, not £47,000,000, but £235,000,000 a year. That was to say, that in the last ten years the wealth of the people to whom the Chancellor of the Exchequer referred as being liable to income-tax, had been increasing seven times more rapidly than in the preceding ten years. Yet that was the class who were to receive consideration at the hands of this social reform Government. They were not unfavourable to differentiation between earned and unearned income. They had repeatedly admitted that to tax at the same rate as unearned incomes those incomes which were arduously earned was a hardship upon those workers whose incomes were just above the taxable limit. A favourable opportunity presenting itself, they would heartily support the removal of such a hardship and injustice. But he submitted that this was not a favourable opportunity, and that that class could well afford to wait until the more urgent claims of the poorer people had been considered and dealt with. Then they had another complaint to make, he was going to say of the action, but rather the want of action on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in leaving untouched incomes above £2,000 a year. That class of income was increasing, and the people with incomes of over £2,000 a year usually did not earn them. ["Oh!"] The Chancellor of the Exchequer had admitted that practically himself, namely, that incomes above £2,000 a year were unearned. Those incomes would escape with the moderate tax of 1s. in the £. If they looked at the question of the super-tax the same thing applied. It depended on the point of view from which they looked at it. It was the wrong point of view to regard what was taken from a man by the tax. The point of view from which to look at it was to see what remained of the income.

---

† See Col. 10.

£6,000 a year paid £300 a year in income tax. £300 looked a big sum, but there remained of the private income £5,700 — an income which in nine cases out of ten was not earned by the individual who had it, and who belonged to a class which was largely increasing and discharged no useful or necessary social service. And there was a social aspect as well as an economic aspect of this question. It was not good for an individual that he should have command of a large income like that without doing honest and useful work. Now, here was a vast field for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to exploit by means of a super-tax. He could have raised sufficient by a super-tax on incomes above £2,000 a year to have started an adequate scheme of old-age pensions. How far would £1,500,000 go to provide a scheme of old-age pensions? The Departmental Committee which inquired into the subject reported that £3,000,000 a year would be required to pay 5s. a week at the age of seventy-five years. £1,500,000 would provide 15d. a week at the age of seventy-five. Why, at the age of seventy-five poor people were not thinking about old-age pensions but funeral expenses. It was an insult to poverty and to the old folk of this country to suggest the beginning of a scheme of old-age pensions with so miserably inadequate a sum as £1,500,000. They were hearing a great deal just now about making a beginning, no matter how moderate. He said that at a time like the present an appeal like that was a traitorous appeal. He would be perfectly willing to have a moderate beginning if that moderate beginning were the only thing they could do. But it was not so in this matter. The income of the community was increasing every year by a sum sufficient to give pensions of 5s. a week at sixty-five years of age to everybody ten times over. When they had a state of things like that, it was a traitorous appeal to ask them to be satisfied with a pension of 15d. a week at seventy-five years of age. The most painful thing to him in the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was the indication of how little he appreciated the social reform spirit of the country. That spirit was not going to be satisfied with homœopathic doses of social reform. The people were beginning to recognise every day more clearly what was the cause of poverty. They were beginning to see the fact that a few people by the power of law were able to appropriate to themselves, without necessarily rendering any useful service whatever, this continual increase of the wealth of the country, and they were quite determined that a social reform Government of the future should deal with this question. They knew that money would be required, and they did not expect it, like the Israelitish manna, to fall from the heavens. But they knew that the money could be found. Earnest social reformers knew where the money could be found, and no Government would continue long to receive their support which was not determined in the most courageous manner to deal with these questions of poverty and social reform, and they were not going to be content to have the spectacle which appeared almost every day in the newspaper of men of whom they had never before heard dying and leaving fortunes amounting to millions of pounds. The Chancellor of the Exchequer by the death duties was going to raise a small sum a year. It was a curious fact that a moderate increase of the percentage on the death duties brought in a very small increase of revenue. They would have to put on a very much heavier percentage if they were going to increase the revenue by any considerable amount. Again he asked the House to look on that question from a practical point of view. If they took £300,000 from a fortune of £3,000,000, there still remained the sum of £2,700,000, a sum far more than necessary to keep those who had the good fortune to inherit it from any fear of the workhouse. Quite inadequately he had put before the House their idea of social reform, and they were going to be satisfied with nothing less. They knew where the money could be found, and he ventured to hope that before the tenure of office of this Government had run out it would take its courage into its two hands and determine to tackle this question boldly, and certain it was, that if the Government did not do this it would meet the fate of every preceding Liberal Government when it had next to appeal to the country.

*Mr. S. T. EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said the speech of the hon. Member who had just sat down was a lecture on social reform rather than a criticism of the Budget, and so it would be regarded by Members of the House. He had listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. Member to see whether or not he had anything practical to suggest. He was quite sure that the hon. Member with the magnanimity which he possessed would confess that there was on the Ministerial side of the House as well as upon the other side below the gangway, a sincere desire for the better condition of the people. The hon. Member demanded that the Budget should bring about an even distribution of wealth. But so far as he understood it, the consideration of the Budget of the year dealt with the equitable adjustment of taxation, and was not the occasion to preach doctrines with regard to the equal division of wealth and of property. They were dealing now with taxes, and not with wealth; and the only part of the speech of the hon. Member which was of a practical character was that in which he suggested that a greater burden of taxation should be placed, as stated by his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Education, on the shoulders best able to bear that burden. General criticism was made by the hon. Member of the taxation of the food of the people—indirect taxation. He himself held the opinion, as the hon. Member did, that too much was being taken from the pockets of the people by means of indirect taxation, but at the same time they ought to remember that it was only by means of indirect taxation that the working classes contributed to the expenses of carrying on the affairs of the country. He thought it would be an evil day if such expenditure as was caused in reference to the war in South Africa could be incurred without being felt by the working classes. They knew perfectly well that the men for whom in a special sense the hon. Member assumed to speak were in large measure, in very large proportion, in favour of the war. For his own part, looking at the general interests of the country, looking to the importance of the country's keeping at peace with the whole world, he thought it would be an evil day when a war could be lightly embarked upon without some of the consequences being directly felt by all classes in the nation. With regard to the taking away, as he supposed the hon. Member suggested, of some of the taxes now imposed, on tea and sugar—for he did not suppose that the hon. Member in his proposal of social reform meant to take away the taxes on beer, spirits, or articles of that kind—personally he would have been glad if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had seen his way to take a penny off the tea duty, and to diminish in some respects the tax on sugar. But, after all, they must in this matter give some confidence to those whose duty it was to look after the affairs of the country, and who made promises—not "indefinite promises," who made appeals—not "traitorous appeals," but who gave definite pledges that a large sum of money which would be got this year out of the increased taxes, together with more money which would be got next year, would be devoted towards a scheme for old-age pensions. The criticism of the hon. Member opposite, if he might without offence say so, would have been better if it had been less exaggerated and less venomous. After all it was really time for hon. Members opposite to cease thinking or saying that all the evil was to be found in the Liberal Party, and that all the good was in their own. Whatever good measures were passed were claimed as the work of the Independent Labour Party. The hon. Member for Leicester, at Cardiff on Sunday last, had boasted that the Trades Disputes Act of last session was, forsooth, the great achievement of the Independent Labour Party. To all those who were in the last Parliament as well as in this Parliament, such language as was used by the hon. Member with regard to the Liberal Party and their promises, their pledges, and performances seemed hardly compatible with the intelligence they knew the hon. Gentleman possessed. What was the use of saying to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had produced a courageous Budget, who had increased in some measure, not so far as the hon. Member wished or as he himself wished, the burden of those best able to bear it, that he was making a traitorous appeal, that the Budget was a dismal disappointment and a miserable failure? Let them come to close quarters and see what was done. First of all, did the hon. Member object to that portion of the Budget which dealt with what might be called paying their way? It was as important for a country to pay its way as for individuals. For his part he regarded it as part of social reform, and whenever he had the opportunity to speak to the working classes, he impressed upon them the importance of keeping free from debt. If they could get rid of the credit system in this country they would go a long way to improve the conditions of which the hon. Member complained. Did the hon. Member complain of that part of the Budget which raised new taxation so far as it went? The proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer followed in some important respects the recommendations of the Income-Tax Committee last year, before which the hon. Member for Blackburn gave interesting and valuable evidence. That Committee had been very successful and had achieved a great deal. It first of all prevailed on the officials of the Inland Revenue to modify their views. It was perfectly well known that the attitude of the Inland Revenue Department had been like a hard wall against which it was no use knocking their heads. The officials of the Inland Revenue Department had induced the former Government and Chancellor of the Exchequer when considering the question of the income-tax to refuse to bring within the purview of such a Committee the consideration in any form at all of the graduation or differentiation of the tax. One of the things which last year's Committee then succeeded in doing was to modify, if not completely to alter, the views of some of the head officials in that Department. They did more than that, they convinced their Chairman, who came to the Committee not at all convinced in favour of differentiation, and greatly doubting the practicability of graduation. They also convinced the President of the Board of Education, who came to the Committee as "hide-bound" as any of the officials against the suggested changes. It was pleasant to hear his right hon. friend defending the proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to many of which he certainly would not have agreed when the Committee began to sit. Moreover, the Committee in a short space of time carried conviction to the mind of the Chancellor of the Exchequer if that were necessary. How far had the Chancellor of the Exchequer gone in dealing with that question? The Committee should be reminded of the number of people with the smaller incomes who would be relieved by the proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. With the income-tax standing at 1s. in the £ under the abatement system, an income of £200 a year paid now at the rate of 2½d. in the £; £300, 5½d.; £400, 7½d.; £500, 8½d.; £600, 9½d.; £700, 10·8d. or nearly 11d. in the £. Everything above £700 was 1s. in the £. In respect of all these incomes which would be earned the tax would this year be again reduced to 25 per cent.; and of course above £700 and up to £2,000 all earned incomes would also have the tax reduced by 3d. in the £. He would give the figures of earned incomes up to £2,000 a year—the incomes affected by the new tax. As far as the Returns showed the incomes under £2,000 a year dealt with under Schedule D. (and it represented only earned incomes), numbered 453,351 separate assessments in Great Britain and 20,501 in Ireland. To that number must be added firms—he did not mean limited companies—and he reckoned that on an average which he thought was very small there were 2½ members to each firm. In that way firms whose incomes were under £2,000 represented 113,647 taxpayers in Great Britain and 4,377 in Ireland. There were other firms whose income was over £2,000, but whose individual members had incomes under £2,000 who would be affected by this proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He reckoned these at about 4,000. Then we had under Schedule E. which represented earned incomes derived from public offices and so forth under £2,000, in Great Britain, 370,477, and in Ireland, 14,875. The total of these figures showed that about 981,228 persons, or nearly a million of taxpayers who paid income-tax on earned incomes up to £2,000 would be relieved by the changes and reductions made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Those interested in the reform of the income-tax would be glad to find that those on whom the burden had pressed most heavily were relieved in such numbers as indicated. The £2,000 limit had been criticised by hon. Gentlemen opposite. His own opinion as a politician was that it was a fair figure, but he could have wished that for the purpose of the better working of the scheme there had been an easier gradation when the figure was approached than the one proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Cases might be put showing that under the scheme as proposed, hardship would arise by reason of the way in which the earned and unearned portions of incomes near the figure of £2,000 were to be dealt with. A man who earned £1,600 and who had an unearned income of £400 (representing a capital of £10,000) and whose income was therefore £2,000 a year, would pay £80 tax: whereas his neighbour who had an income of 2,000 guineas, all of which he earned, and who had no capital would pay £105 tax. He hoped that means would be devised to make the gradation more easy. The other day an hon. Gentleman opposite criticised the application of the principle of differentiation, as between earned and unearned incomes, and not as between precarious and permanent ones. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was perfectly right in saying that the Committee considered this matter very carefully from every point of view. The Committee had considered the question of permanent and precarious incomes, and they came to the conclusion that the best words to express their view and the best principle to be adopted were "earned" and "unearned." He agreed entirely that that was the proper distinction to make. He very much regretted, however, that the Government had stopped at differentiation; because the proposals of the Committee were quite as strongly in favour of graduation as of differentiation. He regretted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not been able this year to give effect to the recommendations of the Committee in that direction, but he noted the fact that the right hon. Gentleman had not shut the door against the principle of graduation. He did not know that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was as enthusiastically in favour of it as he should like, but he was in hope that next year the right hon. Gentleman would espouse the principle of graduation and place a very much heavier tax on the higher incomes. In order to enforce his observations, he would quote the following words of the Committee—

> "Graduation of the income-tax by an extension of the existing system of abatements is practicable."

That had not been done. They stopped at £700. The Committee also said—

> "If it be desired to levy a much higher rate of tax upon large incomes (say of £5,000 and upwards) than has hitherto been charged, a super-tax based on personal declaration would be a practical method."

He did not think that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would meet such difficulties as were anticipated if he proposed to have the declaration made compulsory in the case of every individual. On this head the recommendation of the Committee was as follows—

> "A compulsory personal declaration from each individual of total net income in respect of which tax is payable is expedient, and would do much to prevent the evasion and avoidance of income-tax which at present prevails."

There might be some difficulty in arranging with the Inland Revenue officials for adapting the means now at their disposal to the compelling of personal declarations from everybody this year; but it could not be repeated too often that to demand from 800,000 people or more a personal declaration as they did now, and at the same time to exempt from the making of a personal declaration people who were at the top of the scale, was a thing which could not be defended. Why should they call upon the two-thirds of the income-tax payers who were at the lower end of the scale to make a personal declaration and allow the other one-third at the upper end of the scale to go free? These people with small incomes had to make a declaration if they wanted an abatement. If it was right to extract from them by this kind of pressure a personal declaration it was equally right to compel everybody to declare his income. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was now going to compel all employers to make returns of the incomes of their employees. Everybody in receipt of a taxable salary would be included in the list the employer was bound to make. Why under those circumstances should the employer himself be exempted from revealing his income? He was so strong a believer in the principle of graduation of the income-tax that he would go into the lobby in favour of it, not for the purpose of creating a difficulty for the Government, but for the purpose of bringing some pressure to bear upon them to go forward. Large incomes between £2,000 and £50,000 a year were now taxed only at 1s. in the £. It was unfair and was flying in the face of common-sense and justice to say that very high incomes should be only taxed on the same basis as smaller incomes. Graduation of the estate duties did not, he contended, sufficiently meet what he wanted by the graduation of the income-tax. Death duties only came in once in a generation; but a generation might count anything from five to thirty or more years, and they were fixed once and for all, whereas income-tax varied and might vary annually. What had the Chancellor of the Exchequer done in regard to the death duties? He regarded the Chancellor of the Exchequer as a courageous man, but in this matter he had either shown a great timidity or a supersensitive regard for the posthumous feelings of the millionaires. Why did the right hon. Gentleman not begin at a lower figure than £150,000? And why so mild with estates of over a million? The additional rate above £10 per cent. on estates of more than £1,000,000 only attached to the surplus above the million, so that only estates of £2,000,000 were taxed at the rate of 11 per cent.; £2,500,000 estates at $11\frac{4}{5}$ per cent.; £3,000,000 at $12\frac{2}{3}$ per cent.; £3,500,000 at $13\frac{4}{7}$ per cent.; £4,000,000 at $13\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.; and £5,000,000 at 14 per cent. only. Let the Chancellor of the Exchequer get rid of his fears of the ghosts of departed millionaires and dig in this gold mine to alleviate the condition of the people and start old-age pensions on a large scale. Subject to these criticisms he was in favour of the Budget, and he regarded the pledge of the Chancellor as a definite pledge in favour of old-age pensions. He looked upon the right hon. Gentleman's proposals as the minimum, and the Chancellor could not go further and faster forward in the direction in which he had started than he wished him to travel.

Mr. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.) said that he would not follow the hon. Gentleman who had lectured the House on social reform or the hon. Gentleman who had lectured his predecessor not only on political policy but on Parliamentary decorum. He confessed that the account of the achievements of the Income-Tax Committee, which the hon. and learned Member for Monmouthshire had given, had filled him with a considerable amount of surprise and some amusement. The hon. and learned Gentleman claimed, amongst other things, that the Committee had succeeded in convincing the permanent officials of the Inland Revenue Department that a super-tax was desirable. That he could not understand when he found in the memorandum of Sir Henry Primrose on 23rd July last that that gentleman stated that—

> "Having regard to all those objections"

—that was to the super-tax—

> "it would seem clear that the super-tax ought not to be attempted unless it offered a prospect of an increase of revenue and a really substantial amount sufficient to out-weigh its many manifest drawbacks. I am unable myself to see any such prospect."

Even if the Committee were to rid themselves of that memorandum which had been issued by Sir Henry Primrose, after having heard the other evidence he doubted whether the hon. Gentleman would find any substantial argument in favour of a graduation of the income-tax. One of the difficulties they had to meet all the way through that Select Committee was that, with the best intentions in the world, they were unable to attach the same identical meaning to similar expressions. For instance, at the commencement of the sittings there was considerable discussion as to whether it was practical and expedient that something should be done or as to whether there was any particular rooted objection to the proposal made. It was certainly in the former sense that hon. Members on that side of the House supported certain of the recommendations which were made by the right hon. Baronet the

Member for Forest of Dean. The members of the Committee supported his proposals for reforms by using the word "practical" in a very limited sense. They never suggested that those changes were expedient in themselves or desirable from the point of view of the general taxpayer or of the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself. The hon. Gentleman had said that they had succeeded in convincing the Chairman of the Committee. Most certainly they owed a debt of gratitude to the Chairman for the trouble he took and for the courteous manner in which he conducted the whole affairs of the Committee. But so far as the Committee itself was concerned, the only point on which they were unanimously agreed was that they were unable to accept the Chairman's draft report; and if the right hon. Gentleman was subsequently convinced i was a form of conviction that he did not think would be particularly agreeable to any chairman. He did not rise for the purpose of criticising to any extent the actual proposals which had been made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but only to follow out the prospect which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had partially opened to the House and the country. The Chancellor of the Exchequer very clearly told them that he had budgeted, not so much for the present year, as in contemplation of the changes which he might make next year and in the year following. He thought the prospect which they were permitted to see—and after all it was very little of a definite nature they were able to learn from the Chancellor of the Exchequer—was by no manner of means either a satisfactory or a cheerful one. The more one looked at the prospect the more doubtful one became as to the future. Where there was doubt there must be gloom. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had most clearly intimated to the country that the reserve which he was now proposing to deal with during the current year was not sufficient for him to make even a start with some of those social reforms to which he had committed himself. The right hon. Gentleman in his arrangement of remissions and taxation generally had contemplated, not that he would be able to give further remissions, but rather that next year the expenditure of the country would be considerably increased. That was the only clear and definite matter as regarded the future that he was able to see. Thus, however much the Chancellor of the Exchequer was pledged to schemes of far-reaching social reform, he could not hold out any prospect whatever of any reduction of either indirect or direct taxation. But more than that, he had certainly made some changes which would, in all probability, as time went on considerably reduce the income that he could hope to receive. He had estimated a net reduction of £50,000 for the dual operation of the income-tax and the death duties. Whatever the death duties might bring in in the future, he thought there was every prospect of the remission he had already made in the income-tax leading to considerable demands for remissions of other kinds. The moment they interfered with the very delicate machinery of the income-tax they opened up a very large field for operations, and it was impossible, if they attempted to draw arbitrary lines such as those proposed, to escape inflicting innumerable cases of hardship and difficulty. The right hon. Gentleman had certainly one of the qualifications, among many, for the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer. As a finance Minister, no one could accuse him of being tender-hearted, and he possessed as great a faculty as any of his predecessors for returning an emphatic "No" to the most pressing demands for expenditure. He believed that differentiation between the two classes of income would inevitably lead to demands for further differentiation. He thought that on the whole the prospect which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had opened out with regard to the income-tax would probably mean that the field would be increased and that we should have to look forward to a less revenue than was even now to be obtained from that source. The right hon. Gentleman had also held out the prospect that, by taking back the power over that money which was now intercepted and went to local authorities, he would be able to turn his attention to other sources of income. He would leave the criticism of anything he might do in respect to motor cars until the proposal was placed before the House. But there were other suggestions, he could hardly call them proposals, in regard to which he thought there was a certain amount of doubt in the minds of many of them as to what the right hon. Gentleman's intentions were. In considering the intentions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer one had also to take into view the policy of his supporters. On the first night of the Budget some of his supporters made extremely clear what they considered to be the duty and obligations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer as regarded the question of licensing reform. They were distinctly told that the impression had gone forth that the Government had dropped or did not intend to proceed with their licensing proposals this year. That was said to be a matter of very great disappointment to many of the right hon. Gentlemen's supporters, and they strongly urged him that he should keep hold of his power over licences that he might by the imposition of heavy burdens be able to carry into effect, save for anything which might be done in another place, the vanishing proposals which would have for their effect the diminution of the liquor traffic in this country. How far the imposition of duties for the purposes of carrying out licensing reform came within the strictest definition of a pure free trader he did not know, although he was justified in asking the question; but undoubtedly if the desires which the right hon. Gentleman's supporters pressed upon him were carried into effect it would mean that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not be able to look forward to so large a revenue from the liquor traffic as he had been able to do in the past, and there would on that contemplated change at any rate be a still further drop in the income with which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to make a start in social reform. During the present session they were threatened, although they were not yet in possession of the nature of the proposals, with changes which would have a very considerable effect upon land, upon the government of Ireland, and upon the Army. Everyone of those proposals must, he imagined, operate so as certainly not to produce further income to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but inevitably to entail further expenditure upon the Imperial Exchequer. Possibly it was not fair in some senses to press the right hon. Gentleman to disclose absolutely the financial proposals which would be contained in all those measures, but as the right hon. Gentleman had explained to them that he was unable to give estimates of taxation he hoped he would let them know what would really be the ultimate financial effect of some of these proposals. He asked the other day a question of the Secretary of State for War as to what would be the effect of the financial proposals contained in the Territorial Force Bill. The right hon. Gentleman did not, however, deal with the amounts in question, and the points were clearly for the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but the House of Commons had a right to ask that when money was voted for a particular object there should be definitely and clearly laid down the form and method by which the House of Commons was to be asked to vote the money. In addition to the proposals about the Army he might refer to a proposal made last year to set up a council for the administration of Welsh Education. So far as they were able to extract information that was to be financed by aid grants or block grants voted by the House without any very complete explanation of the purposes for which the money was required, and with very imperfect provision for Parliamentary control, and the audit of the money when expended. The proposals contained in the Army Bill were open to similar objections. Large sums of money were to be voted by aid grants and block grants, which necessarily from the nature of the case could not be properly presented to the House of Commons in a particular form, and therefore Parliamentary control would be reduced to a minimum. So far as he could understand the proposal, a sum of money would be needed for these county associations, and the only check which the Comptroller and Auditor-General would have would be the receipt from these officials that the money had been handed over. There was certainly a provision for audit, but it was not such an audit as was understood by the House. It might be termed a Committee audit. When the right hon. Gentleman was addressing weighty words to the House with reference to control and the demands made upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer by the House he could not help thinking that many of his remarks were strictly intended for the consumption of the Treasury Bench. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to bring to the mind of the Secretary of State for War the enormous importance of seeing that the control of the House over the administration of this new Army system should be as complete and thorough as possible. With regard to the interception of the money which went to the local authorities and which the right hon. Gentleman now proposed to take, he understood that some equivalent grants were to be made to the local authorities. As some doubt had arisen as to what exactly was meant by equivalent grants, he would like to know whether if the revenue from licences increased, an increased contribution would go to the local authorities, or whether the right hon. Gentleman proposed to make a grant equivalent to what they now received and retain the increase himself.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fifeshire, E.) said that under the new system the local authorities would receive exactly the same sum as if the law had not been changed. But one of the objects of the change was to leave the way free to deal with licences. He had announced that this change was to come into effect at the beginning of the next financial year; but he found that there were some technical difficulties in the way, and when the Finance Bill was introduced it would be found that the change would apply to subsequent years only.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH earnestly pressed the right hon. Gentleman to use all the influence he possessed with the Prime Minister to allow the Public Accounts Committee a day for the discussion of their Report. His right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition when Leader of the House in the last Administration gladly gave a day. He did not ask it in order to glorify the Public Accounts Committee, but because it would undoubtedly be of great assistance to the Committee in the future if an opportunity was given to have the work which they did to the best of their ability, and he hoped

thoroughly, discussed by a Committee of the House.

MR. ASQUITH thought it was most important that a day should be given every session for the discussion of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee. It was really remarkable that a business-like Assembly should hitherto have provided no opportunity for the consideration of the work of a Committee that was rendering such invaluable service both to the taxpayers and to the Departments. He was sure the Prime Minister would agree that there could be no more important reform than regularly to devote a day to the consideration of that Report.

*MR. McCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) said he could not share the fears expressed by the ex-Secretary to the Treasury with regard to the proposals of the present Budget. Those proposals to his mind were the beginning of a very great reform. The criticisms of hon. Gentlemen opposite had all through been reasonable, but ineffective. Even the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire when speaking on the last occasion must have felt he was beating the air, and the statement of the hon. Member for Blackburn was nothing but a travesty of what the proposals really were. To say that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had only made very indefinite proposals with regard to old-age pensions, and that he was providing for a pension of 1s. 3d. a week was beyond the region of reasonable discussion, and he was astonished that the hon. Member should speak in such a way of serious proposals and in the face of the definite statement made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He shared the disappointment of the hon. Member as to the shape the Budget had taken. He had looked forward to this Budget as one which would give scope for great financial ability and great schemes. But if the right hon. Gentleman had refused to take advantage to the full of his opportunity it was because he intended next year to lay the foundation for a more ambitious structure. It was the Budget of a strong Chancellor of the Exchequer, conscious of his strength and holding it in reserve; it was the

Budget of a strong Government with no fear of dissolution before it; a Government which, having comparative fixity of tenure, could afford to look forward to laying before the House schemes of far-reaching reform. The right hon. Gentleman was favoured by a combination of circumstances which rarely fell to the lot of a Chancellor of the Exchequer. He was favoured by an increasing revenue and a decreasing expenditure. It might be conceded that a stable and strong Government exercising economy in national finance was the sort of Government which made for national prosperity. The result of last year's finance was that although in the Estimates his right hon. friend had made provision for the largest contribution to the sinking fund for the redemption of Debt that had ever been made he had been better than his word. But it would be as well to point out that while the right hon. Gentleman's surplus last year amounted to £5,300,000, that surplus was due to the accident of miscalculation. The Chancellor of the Exchequer last year somewhat adversely criticised the result of his predecessor's Budget, pointing out that both sides of the account had falsified the estimate to an unprecedented degree. His right hon. friend had broken the record and he would be the first to admit that that was not good finance. So far as expenditure was concerned the right hon. Gentleman was not wholly responsible for the Estimates, but where savings had been made by economy it was entirely to his credit. But the right hon. Gentleman was responsible for estimating revenue, and it had been pointed out by himself at the time that the estimate of the right hon. Gentleman was a very conservative one. He thought that events had justified him, and that Parliament had been very wise in putting it out of the power of any Chancellor of the Exchequer to gamble for a surplus, by saying that the realised surplus should go to the reduction of Debt. So far as the present Budget was concerned there was no difference in the incidence of taxation, and therefore the arguments used from that point of view were not fair. Neither was there any reduction in taxation in the gross, the remission under income-tax being practically balanced by increase in the death duties. As to the proposals with regard to income-tax, all those who sat upon the Committee must admit that his right hon. friend had made a fair proposal. He had given the maximum of relief with the minimum of cost to the revenue, and was to be commended for the courageous way in which he had gone against the views and traditions of his Department in this matter. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had adversely criticised the Chancellor of the Exchequer for bringing Mr. Gladstone to his aid in this matter. But Mr. Gladstone, although he was much impressed with the difficulties of differentiation, always conceded its justice. The matter was so important that he would venture to read an extract from Mr. Gladstone's great Budget speech of 1853 in which he said—

> "What we understand to be the sentiment of the country, and what we ourselves are disposed to defer to and share in, is that under our present financial arrangements the income-tax bears, on the whole, too hard upon intelligence and skill, and not hard enough upon property as compared with intelligence and skill."

Mr. Gladstone went further and indicated that if the income-tax was to be permanent it could only be maintained by removing the inequality which he had pointed out. It was only fair to say that a Conservative Chancellor of the Exchequer in a Budget introduced in 1852 proposed a differentiation of the income-tax. At that time the tax was 7d. in the £, and Mr. Disraeli proposed that earned or precarious incomes should have a rebate. The last Government which was always so sympathetic to the income-taxpayer had that opportunity. He remembered moving an Amendment to two of the Budgets introduced by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer to the effect that differentiation should be made exactly on the lines now proposed. He was confident that the present proposal would give considerable relief and that to the extent of £1,250,000 per annum to a class who were very hardly hit by war taxation. On the other hand, the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed certain reforms in the machinery of collection. In the first place, he was going to insist upon compulsory returns from everybody served with a notice. He was sure that would produce a great increase in the yield of the income-tax. Then there was the reform of insisting upon employers furnishing a return of the salaries paid to their employees. In that connection he was amazed to hear the late Chancellor of the Exchequer practically defending the evasion of the income-tax. This was not a new proposal for an increased burden. All that was being done was simply to provide for a more efficient collection of the income-tax, and the only persons who would be hit by it were those who were dishonestly evading taxation at the present time. He thought the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer should have been the last man in the House to invite any class of income-taxpayers to evade their responsibilities. The third proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a unification of the system of collection so as to assimilate the system in England to that in Scotland. A return of the collection of income-tax was issued last week, and it showed that by 28th February this year in Scotland practically the whole of the income-tax was paid, whilst in England there was outstanding at that time the large sum of £11,500,000 sterling. If his right hon. friend could accelerate the collection in this part of the country they would at once see how much larger the yield would be; they would get within the financial year a larger sum, and there would be a considerable saving in interest. If these proposals were put into operation he was confident that the fear of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that his proposals with regard to differentiation would delay collection, and that he would lose this year £750,000, would not be justified by the result. He did not think there would be any loss to the revenue, and the efficiency of collection would almost counterbalance any remissions that had to be made. They had heard a great deal about a compulsory declaration of the whole income, but that was a reform which was bound to come. The old system was a survival in a most objectionable form of class legislation. Incomes at the present time of £700 and under were legally and justly entitled to pay at a lower rate. They exacted the declaration and a full detailed statement of income from all sources. At the present moment 700,000 income-taxpayers out of 1,100,000 actually made that declaration. That amounted to 65 per cent. of the whole, and therefore, where was the hardship in asking the remaining 35 per cent. to conform to the same system? He had failed to discover that there was any sanctity attaching to the rich man's income. The disclosure of details was quite as embarrassing to the struggling tradesman and the man of moderate means as it was to the rich man. It was only by a compulsory declaration of income that they could levy a fair and just income-tax. The right hon. Gentleman had not touched the principle of graduation, but after the ceremony which had taken place downstairs that day † he thought the example of our Colonies might give his right hon. friend a lead. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was proceeding on the step by step policy. He had not made any change inconsistent with, or which did not lead up to the larger policy, and for that all taxation reformers were very thankful. He was very grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for leaving the abatements at their present limit, and in this respect he flattered himself that the right hon. Gentleman was closely following the lines of his draft report to the Income-Tax Committee. His opinion was that the whole system of abatements ought to go. They ought to have a direct tax at a reduced rate on the whole income. The system of abatements was clumsy, complicated, and expensive, and if his right hon. friend had not followed the example of Mr. Gladstone in 1853 and taken a wide survey of the whole field of finance, it was only because he had postponed taking action. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was looking forward to his Budget of next year, and looking to the estimates of an increasing revenue. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer was engaged in piling up debt, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer was piling up surpluses. The ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer would go down to history as the only Chancellor of the Exchequer who, in a year of peace, added to the National Debt. In two years he had added £14,000,000 to the

---

† Parliamentary Luncheon to the Colonial Premiers, held in Westminster Hall.

Loan Capital Expenditure, and in 1905, after using up the Sinking Fund contribution, he made an actual addition to our aggregate liabilities of £2,000,000 sterling. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be commended upon all sides for considering that it was his first duty to provide for the reduction of our large indebtedness. If they looked to the Estimates of expenditure for the present year, and to the moderate estimates of revenue and reasonable economy in administration, he thought the right hon. Gentleman bade fair to start next year with a surplus of at least £7,000,000 for old-age pensions. While he had very great sympathy with those who complained that old-age pensions had not been started this year, he must say that anyone who looked into the question and took a reasonable view ought to see that there was wisdom in delay. The cost of starting a small scheme and its administration would be out of proportion to the relief given. He commended the Chancellor of the Exchequer for making in two years a net reduction of £23,250,000 in the National Debt. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer took office he had a very difficult task before him, because the National Debt stood at £796,000,000. The last Government swept away the savings of nearly forty years and brought back the National Debt to the figure it stood at in 1868. That was brought about by war expenditure which was the result of reckless diplomacy, and also by extravagant expenditure on the ordinary services of the country which had increased the annual expenditure by £50,000,000 apart from war expenditure. That increase in the ordinary expenditure apart from war expenditure would have provided old-age pensions twice over. They were looking forward to a year of abounding revenue, of reduced expenditure, and a large surplus at the end of it which would enable his right hon. friend to produce the Budget which they were all looking forward to, and was well within his reach.

*MR. J. F. MASON (Windsor) said he had no great fault to find with the Budget as a whole. He most heartily approved of the right hon. Gentleman's proposals for endeavouring to improve the national credit and also of the principle of differentiation between earned and unearned incomes, although he fully realised the difficulty with regard to limitation and definition. If some form of differentiation had been carried into practice as between real and personal estates, he thought one of the principal objections to an increase in the death duties would have been met. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his Budget speech, had referred to the war taxes and described them as being taxes put on not simply to meet expenses during the operation of the war but to meet the extra burden put upon the country by waging the war. Consequently the war taxes still remained and amounted to something like £20,000,000 upon a war debt of £138,000,000. The interest on the war debt amounted to something like £4,000,000, leaving £16,000,000 of war taxes still in existence. He would like to know whether it was proposed that the whole of this £16,000,000 should be applied as a special sinking fund for the war debt irrespective of the ordinary sinking fund. There was no suggestion of the kind, and therefore he held that a large proportion of these war taxes which still existed to the tune of £20,000,000 would not be applied in any way to reducing the debt, but to meeting the ordinary expenditure of the country, and therefore that the existence of the war debt was no adequate reason for maintaining these so-called war taxes. They had had a declaration from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that in his opinion the proportion of direct and indirect taxation should be maintained, and in a further statement that in his view the expenditure of the country could not be expected to be materially reduced in the immediate future. He did not think there would be any doubt upon that subject when they took into consideration the expenditure which would be necessary for carrying out the social reforms which had been promised. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that it was necessary to budget for the next two or three years, and in view of that statement he thought he would be justified in referring not only to this year but to subsequent years in regard to taxation. It was evident that no material saving could be effected in the existing system of expenditure with the exception of the items of defence, for the Army and the Navy. He did not think it had ever been suggested that any large saving could be effected except upon those two items. He did not think anyone would anticipate that any further large savings could be made in those items. It was also evident that the Civil Service expenditure could not be materially reduced; that education was tending towards greater expenditure; and they had a direct promise from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that next year he would introduce a scheme of old-age pensions. He thought it would be admitted that no scheme of old-age pensions would be satisfactory, or would satisfy the country, that was not a fairly comprehensive one, and he did not think that any scheme of that kind could be effected for less than £20,000,000 a year. If he was correct in that estimate they were face to face with the practical certainty that during the lifetime of the present Government, unless it should prematurely commit suicide, they would reach a national expenditure of from £160,000,000 to £170,000,000 per annum. If that happened how, upon the present basis of taxation, would the Chancellor of the Exchequer meet that expenditure? They had a general admission that the proportion between direct and indirect taxation was to be maintained, and therefore he would like to know how it would be possible to raise another £10,000,000 or £15,000,000 from each of these sources. With regard to direct taxation, he did not suppose that it would be proposed in time of peace to raise the income-tax higher than 1s. in the £, and he doubted whether any possible increase in the death duties, or any scheme of graduation which could be proposed, would provide the £10,000,000 or the £15,000,000 required from the side of direct taxation. Even if that part of the sum were provided they would be still left with £10,000,000 or £15,000,000 to be raised by indirect taxation. What was there on the side of indirect taxation capable of producing that very great increase in the revenue? By the alterations which were proposed in regard to local taxation the Chancellor of the Exchequer might place himself in possession of some £200,000 a year derived from a tax upon motor-cars, and he might derive considerable sums from the licence trade; but he thought that if he was to derive anything like the enormous sum of money required to carry out an old-age pension scheme, there would be no escape whatever from enormously increasing the existing taxes on the food of the people, which were already higher than the food taxes of any other country in the world.

*Mr. SEARS (Cheltenham) asked for the indulgence of the Committee while for the first time he took a small part in the deliberations of the House. He desired to refer to the statements contained in the Budget speech which indicated that the Chancellor of the Exchequer intended to introduce very important changes, not merely in the incidence of taxation, but also in the machinery and the administration. He welcomed the statement that the right hon. Gentleman intended to level up the English machinery of assessment and collection so that it might equal in efficiency the admirable machinery at work in Scotland. That was a reform which had been long delayed, and which, he ventured to say, would have far reaching consequences. Not only would that reform make for economy and expedite the collection of revenue, but it would play an important part in the prevention of evasion and secure a far more satisfactory return of revenue. Most of the Scottish machinery for collection and assessments was undoubtedly modern and up to date, but there was still in it some of that old-fashioned type which ought to be scrapped. The system in Scotland still needed to be perfected, and the improved machinery ought to be extended to the whole country. In Scotland the work of collection and assessment was very largely done by trained responsible officers of the Crown. The collectors throughout Scotland were Government officials, and the assessors in twenty-five counties were also Government officials. In three counties, however, the parochial officials still remained, and in six counties two systems prevailed. He asked whether the new machinery to be set up in England was to be modelled on the machinery which was the rule in Scotland and not on that which was the exception. The success of the Scottish system was due to the fact that the irresponsible local official had been almost entirely eliminated. The system in use in England had been condemned again and again by the Board of Inland Revenue. That Board in one of its Reports said—

> "It will be in your Lordships' recollection that we have, for many years, been urging the abolition of a system of collection and assessment of a branch of the revenue through persons unconnected with the executive Government. We have pointed out that, for the most part, they were utterly indifferent to the interests of the exchequer, that they have sometimes been openly opposed to its interests, and engaged in doing their best to defeat the intentions of legislation."

As a friend of his own had said, these officials acted as a kind of buffer between the taxpayer and the exchequer. He wished to know whether the assessment and collection of taxes in England in the future would be placed in the hands of trained and responsible officers of the Crown, and whether that system if adopted would be uniform throughout the whole of the United Kingdom. There were other changes suggested which he welcomed. One was that the claim for exemption and abatements should be presented with the return of the income. Abatements ought to be dealt with at the time of assessment as part of the same transaction. If that were done they would get rid of the cumbersome system of repayment which now existed or at least reduce the repayments branch to reasonable dimensions. He was glad to see that the alarming increase in the staff of the estate duty office had been stopped, and that, on the other hand, there was a proposal to strengthen the outdoor staff, which was responsible for a satisfactory return of incomes. These reforms, whilst reducing expenditure, would have the effect of securing a better return of revenue. There was one other reform very urgently called for, namely, the re-organisation of the Inland Revenue Department upon sound business principles. They had before them in the Budget a great scheme, and he wished it success; but if complete success was to be secured he felt that the Chancellor of the Exchequer must be supported by men who had had practical experience, who were capable administrators, and who had organising abilities. It was important that the heads of departments should be in sympathetic touch with the outdoor staff. There was at the present moment a great deal of dissatisfaction and unrest throughout the Department. That was destructive of efficiency. If that unrest could be removed, the result would be that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have loyal and whole-hearted co-operation from the highest to the humblest Member. In his view this was a very great problem, and he desired to see it settled. To the carrying out of these reforms there would no doubt be considerable opposition, but he hoped that that opposition would be met in a way which would be satisfactory to the Inland Revenue service as a whole and to the public.

*MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said that hon. Members who had taken part in the debate had confined their remarks almost entirely to the very important proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in regard to the income tax. But, after all, those proposals were only part of a very comprehensive and far-reaching scheme. He desired to deal with the Budget as a whole, beginning with a few words as to the year that was past. He was rather surprised to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer's statement that the revenue figures for the year did not exhibit any great elasticity, and that in some respects they were distinctly disappointing. He did not know on what ground the right hon. Gentleman based that opinion, because this much was certain, that however much last year's revenue might have fallen below the private estimate of the right hon. Gentleman, it had exceeded by over £2,000,000 the Budget estimate which he had himself given to the House. He thought himself that the variations of the revenue from the Budget of the previous year were of a very striking character. Far the greatest variation was that in the death duties, which showed an increase of £1,430,000 over 1905–6. The revenue from that source was over £1,000,000 beyond what the right hon. Gentleman had anticipated. That was an enormous addition to the revenue, and a striking testimony to the fact that in this country a few rich men did as a matter of fact contribute large sums in relief of the burdens of their poorer countrymen. He hoped that would give hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House, and particularly hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, cause to reflect that if, as they appeared to consider, a rich man was always and necessarily a public enemy when alive, he was, at any rate, always and necessarily a public benefactor when he was dead. That which was very striking about the revenue last year was the extraordinary way in which the revenue from Customs and Excise yielded up to and above the Budget estimates. The cessation during part of the year of the coal tax, and the reduction of the tea duty, led the right hon. Gentleman to estimate that from Customs and Excise there would be a reduction of £2,275,000. The actual decrease was only £1,425,000, showing that in spite of the dullness of the Stock Exchange, and so forth, the purchasing power of the people of this country—he supposed that after all that was the final test by which to judge our material prosperity—had been not only maintained, but even increased beyond anything that the Inland Revenue had expected. As to the expenditure of the year, the right hon. Gentleman had a surplus of £3,386,000. There were two things which ought to be said in regard to that. The right hon. Gentleman had told them most truly that any congratulation which might have been directed to him in respect of that surplus was really entirely misplaced. That was very true. For, financially speaking, a surplus was not only an error but, as the Committee was aware, a more serious error than a deficit. In the case of a deficit, the attention of Parliament was called to it at once by the necessity for a new grant, and Parliament could then deal with the matter as it chose. But, in the case of a surplus like the present, over £3,000,000 had been withdrawn from the people without necessity, Parliament and the country had been misled to that large extent, and no remedy existed. And, secondly, it ought to be pointed out that all these Budget statements of past expenditure were entirely unreal and illusory. The right hon. Gentleman told the Committee he had spent £139,500,000; but that was not really the whole expenditure on the national services. A further £20,000,000 had been spent which had never got into the Exchequer, but had been intercepted on its way, and did not come within the purview of the statement. It was true that the right hon. Gentleman had appended to his printed financial statement a note purporting to show the entire expenditure for which the State was responsible in 1906–7; and had here mentioned the £10,222,000, intercepted for the Local Taxation Account. But the even larger sum of £10,468,861 intercepted and spent during the year as Appropriations-in-Aid was nowhere referred to. He hoped that next year the latter sum would be included. If the right hon. Gentleman would do that, he would be really informing the House what the entire expenditure was. As to the proposals for this year, he thought the main principles of the right hon. Gentleman's Budget were absolutely sound. For much the right hon. Gentleman had done he would receive the gratitude of this House and the country. But he was even more grateful for what the Budget did not do than for what it did. It did not commit the House or the country to old-age pensions, and it did not ease up one halfpenny of revenue at the expense of the Debt. Everyone would admit that the right hon. Gentleman had done well in placing £15,500,000 to the Debt. That was a very great advance made on any previous payment made in one year to the re-establishment of our national credit, and everyone must admit that the right hon. Gentleman had done well in that respect. Though that repayment was large, it was by no means too large. If this matter was considered from the point of view of hon. Gentlemen opposite who were continually urging the adoption of business principles, it appeared to him that it was the minimum which the House had a right to expect in a time of profound peace. The National Debt at 31st March last was: funded £631,929,000, and unfunded £143,347,210, making together £775,276,210. In addition there were contingent liabilities amounting to £570,000,000, making the national liabilities of all kinds £1,345,276,210. Let him examine the situation in the light of the most elementary business principles. The total income of the country was at] least £1,800,000,000 a year. The total expenditure at the outside lumping everything together, was £170,000,000. The country had therefore in hand, after paying the whole expense of Government every year, at least £1,630,000,000. What would be thought of an individual who, with an income of £1,800, a necessary expenditure of £170, liabilities of £1,345 and an absolute debt of £775, should pay off only £15 of that debt in one year? It was only about 2 per cent. of the absolute Debt; and he took leave to say that if the credit of the country was to be established in that position it ought to be, it should be regarded as a rule that, at least in times of peace, not less than 2 per cent of the Debt should be paid off annually. The right hon. Gentleman added £1,500,000 to the new Sinking Fund, so that the total fixed charge now amounted to £29,500,000. But the right hon. Gentleman regarded that £1,500,000 as an investment only; it was earmarked for old-age pensions. He did not understand what exactly the right hon. Gentleman meant by that. If this money was to be added to the fixed charge for debt, how was it to be free and ear-marked for old-age pensions?

Mr. ASQUITH: For this year only.

*Mr. BOWLES said that then this money was ear-marked not for old-age pensions, but for the reduction of Debt. He thought that everyone must agree with the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposal in regard to sweeping away root and branch the system by which the proceeds of certain duties were intercepted on their way to the Exchequer. From his youth upwards he had been taught to dislike and to distrust the whole system of interception; and he was glad to see any portion of it swept away, not because, as the right hon. Gentleman said, its abolition would free his hands, but because, so far as £10,000,000 were concerned, the hands of Parliament would be freed, and the control of the House would be reassumed. The right hon. Gentleman had said he was going to make equivalent grants to the local authorities. There were a great many charges on this fund. There were the agricultural rates. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman was going to deal with them when he said that he was going to put the local authorities in the same position as they were now in, and he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the equivalent grant was to be made for this year, or for the future. The Local Taxation Account, however, did not represent the whole of the money which was intercepted. As he had shown, a larger sum was annually intercepted in the form of appropriations-in-aid. These large sums were granted not by the House of Commons but by the Treasury; and the House of Commons could not touch, reduce, or even discuss them. If interception was wrong in one case it was wrong in the other; and he earnestly pressed on the right hon. Gentleman the desirability and necessity of making a clean sweep of the whole of this obnoxious system, and of reverting to the great and simple rule of Mr. Gladstone's Act of 1866, that all public moneys should be instantly sent to the Exchequer, and that all issues for public services should be made through the Exchequer and not otherwise. So far he entirely agreed with the proposals of the right hon. Gentleman; but he came now to the right hon. Gentleman's modification of existing taxes. Therein he thought the right hon. Gentleman had shown extremely doubtful wisdom. The income-tax, with all its faults, was the most admirable instrument of extortion ever designed. The right hon. Gentleman told them that the income-tax "must now be regarded as an integral and permanent part of our financial system." It might be regarded as anything they pleased; but he ventured to think that the right hon. Gentleman's proposal would inevitably force him or his successors, to abandon either the present proposals or the tax altogether. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to set up a system of differentiation, and he founded himself on the Report of the Select Committee. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman's studies had led him to the Appendices of the Report of that Select Committee, in which it was shown that there existed at this moment differentiation amounting to 100 per cent. in favour of earned incomes as compared with unearned incomes. To that the right hon. Gentleman added another 25 per cent., on the lower incomes; so that an advantage of 125 per cent was given to the man who, instead of saving and providing for the future, spent his earnings. That was inconsistent with sound policy. It seemed to him that this distinction attempted to be drawn between earned and unearned incomes could not in practice be maintained. There were hundreds of thousands of men in this country who after a life of long labour had saved enough to live on. How could it be said that the income of such men was unearned? His belief was that the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman would involve a quarrel between the Inland Revenue and those whose income was under £2,000, who constituted the bulk of the people who paid income-tax. The system involved a direct and full assessment of all those whose incomes were under £2,000. Hitherto a full disclosure of their exact financial position was only demanded from men whose income was under £700; but they were now going to include also men with incomes between £700 and £2,000. He represented as many of those persons as any Member in this House, and he was assured that they were the very people who would most resent the proposal to compel them to make a full disclosure of their financial position. The tax would no longer be an income-tax, but a notion-tax. What would be taxed henceforward would be not income at all, but the notion as to the character of that income held by the right hon. Gentleman and his officials. The provision for a compulsory return which amounted to forcing everybody to give a legal opinion on a point of extreme difficulty, viz., what was not his real but his statutory income would provoke extraordinary dislike and resistance. So also with the increased penalties, the lengthened time in which proceedings would be taken, and the compulsory return which employers must make of the incomes of their employees. And what did the right hon. Gentleman expect to get in return? Did he expect to receive the gratitude or affection of what were called the middle classes by his proposals? The middle classes were not for sale, and if they were their price would be a good deal higher than the right hon. Gentleman was willing or able to offer. The right hon. Gentleman would not get their gratitude, and he would lose £2,000,000 of revenue. He thought the income-tax proposals of the right hon. Gentlemen were really foolish proposals, which would defeat themselves, and might go far to smash the tax altogether. The death duties were an admirable form of duty if they were equitably applied, but to increase the unjust and foolish graduation of the Act of 1894 was a very great blunder which, in his opinion, would result not in an increase of revenue, but in an increase of evasion. Taking all the estate duties together, there was on some estates a possible tax of 19 per cent. Now there would be a possible tax of over 20 per cent. A few weeks ago a large estate passed twice within six weeks, and under the right hon. Gentleman's proposals, such an estate might be nearly halved in that short time. Such duties offered an enormous temptation to evasion and to the very persons most able to evade them. He did not think the right hon. Gentleman would, by means of his new proposals, obtain £1,200,000 a year. He felt, however, that they all owed a debt of gratitude to the right hon. Gentleman for adopting the main lines upon which he had proceeded, but he thought that in his genuine desire to meet what were felt to be injustices and grievances in regard to the income-tax, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had merely introduced new and more obvious injustices and grievances which, without any conceivable advantage to the revenue, might go far to smash the tax altogether. The income-tax and estate duty proposals were dangerous and quite unnecssary blemishes on an otherwise sound and courageous budget.

*Mr. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.) said the hon. Member for Norwood had drawn a lurid and terrifying picture of the financial position of the nation, and he should really like to reassure him. The hon. Member had said that our expenditure was £170,000,000, but he had included in that sum the whole of the £17,000,000 which represented the outgoings of the Post Office, which, of course, were counterbalanced by revenue on the other side, to say nothing of £5,000,000 profit into the bargain. If his hon. friend would go into the figures he would find that our expenditure was £125,000,000, and even if he added the local taxation account he could not make it up to more than £135,000,000. Then the hon. Member had said that the liabilities of the country were £1,345,000,000. Where did the hon. Gentleman get that figure? He got it by adding to the National Debt, properly so called, which represented the money sunk in past wars, and which had not against it any tangible assets whatever, the hundreds of millions of pounds more which were borrowed by municipalities, and which were represented at this moment by tangible assets, such as waterworks, gasworks, and many other valuable undertakings. In the case of Warrington it was stated at a council meeting the other day that Warrington's undertakings could be sold out for something like 26s. 8d. in the £ of the borrowed capital. What was true of Warrington was true of many other places, and if municipal undertakings were in the market there was not the slightest doubt that they would be at once bid for by company promoters at many times the figure which the hon. Gentleman had been good enough to add to our National Debt.

Mr. BOWLES said the question of whether a good or bad use was made of borrowed money did not alter the fact that it had been borrowed.

Mr. CHIOZZA MONEY said that it was equally true that joint stock companies borrowed their capital. Would the right hon. Gentleman on that account add the railway capitals to our National Debt? However, he would not pursue the point further at that late period of the debate, but would address himself to the actual proposals of the Budget. He congratulated his right hon. friend as heartily and fully as the hon. Gentleman had done on his reduction of the National Debt, and there was only one *caveat* that he wanted to enter in regard to it. He had for years, in speaking to working-class audiences, represented to them that it was to their interest that the real debt resting on the people of this country should be paid off as soon as possible; but, when we were raising the money which was to pay off that debt, ought we not to have regard to the means of those who paid the money? The means of the taxpayer entered fully as much into every million we raised to pay off debt as it did in regard to every million we used for any other purpose; and, it seemed to him that, while many excellent and sound principles were recognised in the Budget, and while they were grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for what he had done, still he thought the Budget did not take sufficient account of the arguments he was advancing, and of the Resolution which was unanimously accepted by the House before the Easter recess to the effect that, having regard to the wealth and the distribution of the wealth of the United Kingdom, it was their duty to readjust taxation in order to provide for necessary social reforms. What he had to say was chiefly directed to that head, to which he would address himself very briefly. According to his calculations—he would not give the details there, but would go over them in private with any hon. Member who would have the patience to hear what he had to say—according to the figures he had got out, when they had reckoned up the whole of the various sums paid in the way of taxation by various classes of this country, the people with incomes of over £5,000 a year paid, treating it all as income-tax, a tax but a few pence higher than the tax which was paid by the manual labourer. The manual labourer paid, if all taxes were reduced to an income-tax, an average of 1s. 5d. in the £, while rich people of over £5,000 a year income paid 1s. 7d., or say only 2d. more. His right hon. friend had not, he thought, paid sufficient attention to that, and he did not think he sufficiently recognised the fact that not only the manual labourers but the black coated working men were paying too much, especially if regard was paid to the case of the average clerk with a small salary, the average traveller, the average journalist, the average shopkeeper, or the average schoolmaster. The last-named, for instance, began at £70 to £80, and if he reached his maximum, he only got £200 a year.

That was a class of income-tax payer to which this Budget did not do sufficient justice. Why was that? Because his right hon. friend had had regard to the minor and not to the major injustice. That was to say, as to the man who had earned £200 and the man who received £200 which he had not earned, it was obviously unjust to tax them alike. Then again, to tax a man with £200 a year income earned or unearned and the man with £5,000 a year at the same rate was to do a great injustice. His right hon. friend had had regard to one injustice but not to the other, and if regard had been had to the main injustice the middle classes would have had more relief than they had received. Under the present proposals a man with £200 a year would gain relief to the extent of 10s. a year, but supposing the sugar duty had been repealed he would have gained 16s. a year. He would therefore have gained more by the repeal of the sugar duty than he did by the reduction of the income-tax on incomes below £2,000. Again, when they examined the details of the Budget proposals and asked themselves who were the people who, after all, gained most, they found that the nearer a man approached towards the top of that arbitrary line of £2,000 the greater advantage he got. By the reduction in the income-tax the man with £2,000 a year gained £25 while the man with £200 a year gained only 10s. That he was sure his right hon. friend would agree did not leave the incidence of our taxation in a satisfactory position. He was glad to hear that his right hon. friend had no intention of permanentlycontinuing the sugar tax. By his remarks in introducing the Budget some people thought that the sugar tax was to be kept and that a part or the whole of it was to be devoted to old-age pensions, a proposition which should be resisted. Reverting to the income-tax he pointed out that most extraordinary injustice was created by the £2,000 a year limit. The man with £2,000 a year paid £75, while the man with £2,200 paid £110, or a difference of £35. That was the natural result of drawing arbitrary lines. He would be the last to criticise the Budget merely on hard cases, but he pointed out that so long as arbitrary lines were drawn they would have these hard cases arising. He thought the way out of it would ultimately be found to lie in a properly graduated income-tax, graduated by sufficient steps to enable justice to be done between man and man, while it would not induce people to make false declarations to get under a large step in the scale. Let them take the step as between £700 and £2,000 a year. It was obvious, human nature being what it was, the man with £2,200 would be sorely tempted to declare his income at £2,000 a year in order to get within that step. They all thought the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer made a false point when he said that it would be a hardship upon the working men, who had so far evaded the income-tax, if new regulations were made which would bring them within it. He was the first to agree that such working men who had the good fortune to earn over £160 a year ought to be brought within it, and he knew a number of them who paid income-tax. Why did they pay it? Because they were in the employ of limited liability companies who had to make a return of the wages of their employees; but how unfair it was that a man in such an employ should have to pay income-tax, while the man who worked for a private employer did not. The right hon. Gentleman opposite had only just missed making a very good point in that connection. He said that without intention of discourtesy. If a man had a mixed income (an income from a business returned under Schedule D. and an income from Consols or other securities) amounting to £10,000 a year, he had not to declare his whole income. That of course prevented him being taxed justly. But that man was to sit down and disclose the secrets of his employees and say that Tom Smith received £300 a year and John Jones £500, and so on. That point entirely disposed of the argument frequently used against personal declaration of all incomes—the argument that they only obtained disclosure of incomes by offering the abatements as an advantage. No advantage was offered, because the employers would have to sit down and declare the total income of their employees. But what they had to do for their employees they had not to do for themselves. Nearly 1,000,000 out of 1,100,000 income-tax payers had to declare their income in one way or another, while the other 100,000, the rich, were to be left out of account. The question of a graduated income-tax was surely settled as to its practical applicability by the example of Prussia. Prussia had a population about equal to the population of this country, though its wealth was not so great. It was a great industrial country and had its great landlords and great industrial corporations and possessors of incomes from many sources just as we had. Prussia found it necessary to take its income-tax down to incomes as low as £45 a year. That was because the standard of living was not so high and the wages and profits were lower. But on the other hand they carried their graduation up to incomes of £5,000, an income analagous to £10,000 a year in this country. It followed that if we adopted the same principle of graduation of income-tax as that in force in Prussia we should graduate up to incomes of £10,000 or £15,000, in which case the ends of justice would be substantially served. If such a system were adopted there would also be an end of the silly talk about a "shilling" or "ninepenny" income-tax which in practice did not exist. Few people had been paying a "shilling" at all, but a "shilling" tax was felt as though it existed. It must be borne in mind that in politics sentimental grievances were quite as important and had just as much to be taken into account as real grievances. By adopting a graduated income-tax not only would real grievances but also purely imaginary ones be remedied. The income-tax in this country was 1s. in the £ or 5 per cent. In Prussia it was 5 per cent., in addition to which there was a property tax of 1¼ per cent. which gave 6¼ per cent. for Imperial purposes; he commended that to hon. Gentlemen opposite who said that if we had protection we should have no income-tax. In Prussia a limited company was allowed to deduct 3½ per cent. from its profits, and then had to pay income-tax upon the remainder, and when those profits were distributed the individuals who received them had to pay income-tax all over again. Did hon. Gentlemen who talked about capital being driven out of this country by 1s. income-tax suggest that capital was being driven out of Germany by these taxes? If so, where did that capital go? All the experience of death duties and the high income-tax during the war went to show that reasonable taxation such as was proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, did not drive capital out of the country. If we adopted a system of graduation a form for personal declaration might be adopted as simple as that in force in Prussia. With regard to the increased death duties he appealed to his right hon. friend to revise the scale which he had set up. The right hon. Gentleman had said that a fortune of £2,000,000 would pay 10 per cent. on the first £1,000,000 and 12 per cent. on the second. That was 11 per cent. on the whole, then why not say so, or better still why not raise the duty to the higher of the two percentages and say that a fortune of £2,000,000 should pay 11 per cent. and a fortune of £3,000,000 and over 12 per cent. and so on. He now came to the "nucleus" for old-age pensions. In the first place that nucleus was a problematical sum which could only be realised if good trade continued into the financial year ending 31st March, 1909. They must not forget that. Against that, on the other hand, they must remember that, if trade held good, the nucleus might be much larger. Undoubtedly the administrative income tax reforms were likely to yield much new revenue. He would not be surprised to find 100,000 more income-tax payers brought to light by these proposals. Therefore the nucleus might be much larger than £2,000,000. At the same time he ventured to urge that the sugar tax must go. It was not for them to come to the House to support proposals for the continuation of the sugar tax, and they wanted a definite statement from the Government that it was not to be made permanent. The Board of Trade returns shewed that the consumption of sugar before this tax came into operation was 90 lbs. per head of the population, and that in 1905 it was only 76 lbs. per head. That was a very serious fact. It might to some extent be attributable to low wages, but it could not be denied that it was also attributable to this tax. Then again, they were to have old-age pensions: he wished to know what sort of pensions they were to be, and who were the people to have them. He did not think they ought to be satisfied to lay down their work in the

House and go to the country unless they granted pensions to persons of sixty-five years of age and upwards and not seventy years. The lower age would involve a very large sum of money. How were they to get it? Hon. Gentlemen opposite sought to get it by taxing our imports, raising the price of the food of the people, and endangering the supply of raw materials. But the revenue could not be raised by such means without endangering the very sources of our prosperity. He submitted that the only sensible solution was to be found in a graduated income-tax. In view of the fact that this country had, above the income-tax line, an income, which probably reached about £1,000,000,000, in 1907 we certainly ought not to deny succour to the aged poor merely because it would cost £20,000,000 or £25,000,000. Our means were ample. There was something even more important than old-age pensions, and that was the care of the child, which had been so eloquently referred to by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He submitted that if we spent more on the education and nurture of the child there would be less need for old-age pensions. In conclusion he ventured to disagree with his right hon. friend when he uttered that mournful epigram that he believed in the right of every man to make less than the best of himself. Surely if evasion of taxation was denounced in that House, evasion of work should be warmly condemned. The man who refused to contribute to the national dividend made other men work for him.

Sir WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith) said he had no intention of occupying the time of the Committee at any length. He desired to put one question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to the exemption and abatement on incomes of married persons. He thought the time had come when some relief from income-tax should be given to married persons who each had a small income. A man and a woman with incomes of £400 a year got a rebate of £160 each when single, but if these two married, their incomes were put together and they were not allowed to claim any abatement. Yet two sisters or two brothers who had similar incomes and lived together could each claim abatement. If the right hon. Gentleman could not see his way to admit the principle of giving the whole abatement in such cases he might have allowed three-fourths. So strongly did he feel on the subject that he moved as an Amendment that a further penny be taken off the income-tax.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'one shilling,' and insert the words 'eleven pence,"—(*Sir William Bull.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'one shilling' stand part of the proposed Resolution."

Mr. ASQUITH hoped the hon. Gentleman would not insist on the Amendment, at any rate at this stage. He thought himself that it would be the height of absurdity to reduce the income-tax by a penny for the whole population in order to deal with what, after all, could only be a grievance in the case of a very limited class. If married people were entitled to exemptions the matter could be dealt with quite well in Committee on the Bill. The Government could not possibly accept the Amendment. He would be prepared to discuss the Amendment with the hon. Gentleman when the fit occasion arose, but the loss to the revenue would be far greater than he probably had any conception of. It had been considered by successive Chancellors of the Exchequer and rejected on that ground. On the other hand, a large concession was made a few years ago by which when the joint earned incomes did not exceed £500 they could be treated as separate.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley) said he desired to deal with one point which had been referred to by the hon. Member for North Paddington. The only consolation given by the hon. Member to the House was that we had a national income of £1,000,000,000, per annum. The hon. Member seemed to regard that fact as satisfactory without having regard to the distribution of that income. He did not explain how in the face of this flourishing state of things there was such wide-spread destitution in the country, not among the very poorest classes only, but among the labouring classes as well, through lack of employment. The one point which he wished to deal with was the statement in which the hon. Member ridiculed the assertion that capital was being driven out of the country. He would like to put one concrete and deplorable case—that of a firm of manufacturers in Birmingham, who dealt in goods connected with the trade in weighing machines, who a few months ago were reluctantly compelled to transfer a large section of their works to the United States because so high a tariff had been raised against their goods. The Chairman in a most affecting speech said the shareholders would not suffer, that their dividends would probably be increased, because they would be able to supply not only America but England as well; but what concerned him more than he could say was the fact that they would be obliged to dismiss large numbers of men who had worked for the company for many years and employ American labour. He asked the hon. Member and the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether that was not taking capital out of the country. It could not be denied, nor could it be denied that that was a typical case of what had been going on for years. He saw before him hon. Members who knew of numbers of firms who had had to transfer, or partially transfer, their trading concerns to other countries. In all cases the shareholders got an increase in their incomes from the same concern. When capital was transferred in this manner to foreign countries each case meant the discharge of a large number of workmen. Therefore, he hoped it would not be asserted again that there was no transfer of capital from this country on account of the system which the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in spite of everything, would call free trade. The right hon. Gentleman knew as well as he did that we had not got and never had had such a thing as free trade. Whilst this country had been giving every facility foreign countries had been closing their markets to us, and if the right hon. Gentleman called that free trade he had a very peculiar idea of what free trade meant. He seemed to be——

Mr. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.) upon a point of order, asked whether the Amendment of the hon. Member for Hammersmith was still before the Chair, or had it been withdrawn.

*The CHAIRMAN: The Amendment has not been withdrawn, and the discussion raised by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bordesley is not really in order on the Amendment, so it would be better to divide on the Amendment and dispose of it.

Question put.

The Committee divided:—Ayes, 314; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 141.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh
Brunner, Rt. Hn Sir J. T (Chesh.
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crosfield, A. H.
Davies, David (Montgomery Co
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William

Devlin, Joseph
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dillon, John
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, C. H. (Boston)
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Findlay, Alexander
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc.)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, W.E.(Derbyshire,N.E.
Harwood, George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazelton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Langley, Batty
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,Sir Joseph F.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy (Essex,Harwich
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shauhgnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C.E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim, S.)
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walsh, Stephen
Walton,Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)

Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel
Yoxall, James Henry

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmwood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchest'r
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Bull, Sir William James
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Wor.
Clark, George Smith (Belfast, N.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Niell, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. (Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Original Question again proposed.

*MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) said he wished to raise a question which while of comparatively small importance to the Treasury was of great importance to a large and very deserving body of His Majesty's subjects, namely pensioners. He did not refer only to Government pensioners, but to all who drew pensions from whatever source, public or private. The question was raised by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer the Member for East Worcestershire, who asked what the position of a pensioner would be under the scheme of differentiation between "earned" and "unearned" incomes. The right hon. Gentleman replied that he had an open mind on the subject, and would be glad to hear the argument on both sides. He (Mr. Smeaton) desired briefly to state the case for the pensioners, and, in doing so, thought he could not do better than quote the words of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in contresting the condition of two classes of income-tax payers, represented by A and B. He would call the attention of the Committee to the following quotation. The right hon. Gentleman on Thursday last said—

> "The income-tax is really a two-fold tax, it is a tax on property and a tax on earnings. I start with this proposition, and a most important proposition it is, that it must now be regarded as an integral and permanent part of our financial system. If that proposition is once enunciated and admitted, it makes it impossible to justify, if there be any practical way of escape, the present incidence of the income tax. After you have reached the limit of abatement, which is now £700, the State taxes all incomes at the same rate, whatever may be their character or source. Just compare two cases. You have here A, a man who derives, we will say, £1,000 a year from a perfectly safe investment in the funds, perhaps accumulated and left to him by his father; on the other hand you have B, a man making the same nominal sum by personal labour in the pursuit of some arduous and perhaps precarious profession or some form of business. The one

> is under no necessity to make provision either for his children or for old age—the income will go on being automatically received as long as the investment remains; the other, if a man of ordinary prudence, is bound, his work being carried on subject to risks to health and all the other vicissitudes of fortune, year by year to deduct from his nominal income and set aside a sufficient sum to make provision for contingencies in the future. To say that those two people are, from the point of view of the State, to be taxed in the same way is, to my mind, flying in the face of justice and common sense."

He considered, and believed the Committee would agree with him, that the case of B was exactly the case of the pensioner. Pensions, whether in business or in Government service, were all on the same footing. They were simply the balance of salary for work done—paid to the worker when his busy life was over, and when, as so often happened, he had a very short time left to enjoy it. The Committee knew how precarious was the life of men who came home after a long term of service abroad, and how urgent was the necessity imposed on them to stint and save from their pension for the sake of their families. Pensions were of two kinds, contributory and non-contributory. Non-contributory pensions were simple deferred pay. Contributory pensions were doubly deferred pay. Now to return to the Chancellor's illustration of A and B. The investments of A remained after his death, while the pension of the pensioner vanished at his death. It seemed to him that the case of the contributory pension was even stronger than that of the non-contributory pension; because at the death of the pensioners not only did the pension vanish, but also the entire contribution of a lifetime. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would, when he came to define "earned" incomes for the purposes of differentiation include in "earned" incomes all pensions, whether contributory or otherwise.

*Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said that an hon. Member below the Gangway on the other side had said that it was very difficult to drive capital out of this country, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had claimed this as one of the advantages of free trade, but they had the authority of the present secretary of the Cobden Club for the statement that during the last fifty years the capital and plant of this country had been steadily flowing abroad, so that we now owned thousands of manufactures in all parts of the world. Would the Chancellor of the Exchequer say that this was another of the advantages of free trade? In his Budget speech the right hon. Gentleman said—

> "We are a free trade Government in a free trade country."

Were we? He did not think we were even a bad imitation of a free trade country. At all events some of the necessaries and most of the luxuries of the working classes were heavily taxed, and so were our exports by which the working classes got their work and wages. He could not see where freedom of trade came in in our case. The Chancellor of the Exchequer prided himself that all the money produced by the present import taxes on the necessaries and luxuries of the poor went straight into the exchequer, but he quite forgot to state also that all the money on those necessaries and luxuries of the poor came straight out of the pockets of the poor, because there was no competition with an un-taxed supply. We appeared to be ruled to a great extent by catch words in this country, and the word "free-trade" was one of them. We had not got anything approaching free-trade in this country. If it were not for the word "free" which was stuck in very wrongly in regard to our trade, he did not believe that the working classes would be taken in by the present absurd system of taxation. He did not believe that they would believe it very long. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget speech told the House that free trade was the breath of life to us. With all due respect he hardly thought that anybody except an English Cobdenite lawyer could have made such an absurd statement. On the 1st of March last the Minister of the Interior in the German Parliament said he would like to know who invented the fairy tale that Great Britain was a free trade country. He (the German Minister) said that he found as the result of careful calculation that he had established the fact that the import duties per head of the population in Great Britain were 16s. 8½d.; in America, 14s. 11½d.; and in Germany only 10s. 6d. Moreover, that this was not all, for while in Great Britain the duties were imposed mainly on the necessaries of the poor, in Germany they were levied to a very great extent on manufactured goods which were not in any sense necessaries of life to the poor. In 1894, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that English trade in those days carried on its operations under great formidable and increasing difficulties and that the tariff walls which excluded us from foreign markets were every day getting higher. Another great authority, the Secretary for India, in a speech at Manchester in 1903, stated that it was a matter of life and death to us to persuade other nations to rally to the free trade flag and come round to the open door. If it was a matter of life and death to us we had not been doing very well lately, because other nations had been getting further and further away from what the right hon. Gentleman called the free trade flag. Though the Chancellor of the Exchequer called this a free trade country he imposed a 30 per cent. tax on sugar which he said was a necessity and food for working people; he imposed 25 per cent. on coffee, 1d. on raw cocoa, 2d. practically on manufactured cocoa, and 75 per cent. on tea, all these things being really necessities of the poor. Besides, there was the heavy taxation on beer and tobacco. Yet the wonderful Liberal Party were allowed to go about the country shouting that a possible tax of part of half a farthing on the four-pound loaf would bring starvation on the people. It seemed to him that this system of taxation was so arranged that the poor paid all the taxes on the things which they used and that they paid all in the increased prices because there was no competition with the untaxed supplies. That was what hon. Gentlemen opposite called free trade. Our system of taxation was so framed that it taxed the poor very heavily, while to a great extent it prevented the working classes of the country from earning the wages which they ought to earn in manufacturing the luxuries which rich people used in this country. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that he could not tax motor-cars. He did not think, however, that it would have required a very desperate effort to have put about 12 per cent. on foreign motor-cars. That would have been about equal to the rates and taxes which the manufacturers paid in this country for the motor-cars they made, and the right hon. Gentleman might have had all the money he got from it for old-age pensions.

Mr. ASQUITH asked how much this would come to.

Mr. HUNT said that the importation last year was about £4,000,000 worth, and he left it to the right hon. Gentleman to reckon up what the yield of the tax would be, as he was no doubt better at arithmetic. It seemed to him that as long as the right hon. Gentleman stuck to the system which he was pleased to call free trade and refused to tax the luxuries of the rich and the manufactured goods which we could make in this country it was perfectly absurd for him to pretend that he would be able to give old-age pensions to the working people of the country. It appeared to him that they were ruled by a Ministry of lawyers, and that their ideas of economy and their policy were ending in the driving out of home and work thousands of honest working men at Woolwich and other places who for many years had served their country well, while on the other hand they received with open arms all the diseased and indigent riff-raff of the Continent.

*The CHAIRMAN: What the hon. Member is now saying has no reference to the question before Committee.

*Mr. HUNT said he was sorry if he was out of order, but he thought the fact that aliens came in here did affect the question of taxation. It appeared that hon. and right hon. and learned Gentlemen on the front Government Bench were full of old-fashioned out-of-date Cobdenite theories which were repudiated by all the rest of the civilised nations of the world. [An Hon. Member: Except Turkey.] He did not know that Turkey was counted. They were so full, too, of legalities and technicalities that their undoubtedly great brains had no room for even a little bit of ordinary common sense. He was only sorry that he could not tell them in the House of Commons in downright strong Anglo-Saxon what he thought of the absurdity and even cruelty of their policy toward the working classes of the country.

*MR. THEODORE TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer had fully considered the difficulties of distinguishing between earned and unearned income in business. He would take the case of three brothers in partnership earning, say, £1,000 a year each. For purposes of their own they turned their business into a limited liability company. If they took £1,000 a year each as salary their income was earned. If they took £200 a year in salary they had to pay on £800 a year as unearned income. It seemed to him that there was need for very careful study of this matter. No doubt the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in spite of the criticisms of the hon. Member for Ludlow, had a little room left in his brain to think out this problem. It was not so easy as it looked. The hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division had said that firms who formed themselves into limited liability companies ought to pay on their dividends as unearned income. That depended, of course, upon the motives which these firms had in forming themselves into limited liability companies. It was to the interest of the community to encourage employers to give shares out of profits to their employees. He had gone in for that plan and had found it was a good one for both sides. It was not a motive contrary to but in favour of the public interest. He would take his own company. That company at its formation paid toll to the State on its capital. Was it right and was it in the public interest that those of its members with incomes between £160 and £2,000 a year should be further fined because the concern had been made a company? He thought that some consideration should be given to firms whose motives, at all events, were quite clearly in line with public interest in forming their concerns into limited liability companies. He hoped it would be his lot to be always above the sum that would not have any advantage. It had not always been so in the past. But there were several men in his concern which this matter would affect, and it was in the public interest, he maintained, to encourage employers, not only to give a share of their profits to their employees, but to go further, and, as was done in some cases in France, and as he did himself, give that share of profits in the shape of shares in the company itself. They ought to increase the motive that would cause employers to do this kind of thing and not diminish it. He wished to congratulate the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the Budget. He had never heard before such a doctrine as that expressed by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer when he condemned the present Chancellor for demanding from employers a list of salaries paid to their employees, and approved of the evasion of the tax that had been practised in the past. If they had laws let them carry them out. He was glad to say his firm — though not compelled to give particulars—had done so in the past, because neither his firm nor the employees desired to evade what he believed was the most just tax in principle, though it did not always work out to be the most equitable tax in practice. As to the sugar tax he did not agree with the Chancellor that it could not have conveniently been halved. He was very sorry it was not at least reduced. The only excuse for leaving it on was the near prospect of old age pensions. He congratulated the Chancellor of the Exchequer on carrying still further the death duties, and he would ask those who represented labour not to be too suspicious of the Government, because, after all, they could catch more flies with treacle than with vinegar. He believed in the genuineness of this Government's promises to the House of Commons that they would make a real beginning with old-age pensions. He looked upon them with trust and hope and a firm conviction that they meant what they said, and that they believed they would do far better to wait a little until they could make a real substantial beginning. He did not believe in individuals or in Governments that made too many promises; but he did believe that this Budget was a step towards a great advantage to the aged poor next year; and for that reason he supported it.

Mr. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) said he wanted to show that the tax was evaded in the case of foreign bonds and coupons the interest on which was paid in New York, Paris or London.

Mr. ASQUITH said that it was absolutely necessary that this Resolution should be carried to-night, and he asked if the hon. Gentleman would be good enough to postpone his observations.

Question put, and agreed to.

Estate Duty.

2. Resolved, That in the case of persons dying on or after the nineteenth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, the rates of estate duty under section seventeen of the Finance Act, 1894, be amended so that—

Where the Principal Value of the Estate				Estate Duty shall be payable at the rate per cent. of	Instead of
Exceeds— £			£		
150,000	and does not exceed		250,000	Seven pounds - - -	Six pounds ten shillings
250,000	,,	,,	500,000	Eight pounds - - -	Seven pounds
500,000	,,	,,	750,000	Nine pounds - - -	Seven pounds ten shillings
750,000	,,	,,	1,000,000	Ten pounds - - -	Seven pounds ten shillings
1,000,000	,,	,,	1,500,000	Ten pounds on one million and eleven pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
1,500,000	,,	,,	2,000,000	Ten pounds on one million and twelve pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
2,000,000	,,	,,	2,500,000	Ten pounds on one million and thirteen pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
2,500,000	,,	,,	3,000,000	Ten pounds on one million and fourteen pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
3,000,000 - - - - - -				Ten pounds on one million and fifteen pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds

—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Income-tax (Inclusion of all Offices and Employments in Schedule E).

3. Resolved, That the income-tax charged on offices or employments of profit, whether public or not, be charged under Schedule E in the Income-Tax Act, 1853.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Income-tax (Limitation on the Aggregate Amount of Deductions or Repayments for Wear and Tear).

4. Resolved, That no deduction or repayment be allowed in any year in respect of the diminished value, by reason of wear and tear, of any machinery or plant which, when added to the deductions or repayments allowed on that account in previous years, will make the aggregate amount of the deductions or repayments exceed the actual cost of the machinery or plant.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Income-tax (Abolition of Repayments in respect of Assessment on Average Income).

5. Resolved, That any abatement, relief, or repayment of income-tax under section one hundred and thirty-three of the Income-Tax Act, 1842, as amended by section six of the Revenue Act, 1865, shall cease.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Income Tax (Assessment on Trades, etc., recently commenced).

6. Resolved, That income-tax charged under Schedule D in the Income-Tax Act, 1853, on professions, trades, or vocations shall, in the case of professions, trades, or vocations which have been set up or commenced within the three years on which the average income is to be computed under the Income-Tax Acts or within the year of assessment, be charged with reference to the actual profits or gains arising in the year of assessment.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Resolutions to be reported To-morrow.
Committee to sit again To-morrow.

LOCAL TAXATION GRANTS [CONSOLIDATED FUND].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient that the following grants to Local Taxation Accounts, namely—

(1) The Estate Duty grants paid under Section 19 of the Finance Act, 1894; and

(2) The Agricultural Rates grant paid under Section 2 of the Agricultural Rates Act, 1896; and

(3) The Scottish Agricultural Rates grant paid under Section 3 of the Agricultural Rates, Congested Districts, and Burgh Land Tax Relief (Scotland) Act, 1896,

instead of being paid out of the revenues out of which they are payable under the present law, be charged on and paid out of the Consolidated Fund, but in the case of the grants which are payable during the continuance of any temporary Act, only so long as that Act is continued, and that where under the present law the proceeds of any duties are paid to any local taxation account, a sum equal to the proceeds of those duties at their present rates be paid to that account out of the Consolidated Fund, and the actual proceeds of the duties be paid into the Exchequer.—(*Mr. Runciman.*)

Resolution to be reported To-morrow.

SIR HORACE PLUNKETT.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.) rose to call attention to the position of Sir Horace Plunkett as Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture in Ireland, and to move the following Resolution standing in the name of the hon. Member for South Tipperary:—"That the position of Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture in Ireland was intended by Parliament to be and in fact is a Ministerial and Parliamentary office, properly vacated upon a change of Government, and that the retention of that office by a political opponent of the Government of the day is undesirable as a permanent arrangement." The hon. Member said that all his colleagues regretted the illness of the hon. Member for South Tipperary who was to have proposed this Motion. In consequence he had to take it up at very short notice, but while it was a subject on which much could be said, very little ought to be necessary in the present House of Commons. The Motion dealt with the occupation of a purely Ministerial and political office in Ireland by an ex-Unionist Member of Parliament, and they asked the Government to deal with the question constitutionally and without further delay. In the year 1899 an Act was passed by the Tory Government creating a Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction in Ireland. With that Department and its work this debate had nothing to do. Some people would say the work was good and the results satisfactory. Many others would say that the work was great only as far as the expenditure of £500,000 a year was concerned, but that the grass grew no greener or thicker nor did the hens lay more largely or more quickly in consequence. With these different views, however, the Motion did not deal; it referred to the occupation of a political and Parliamentary office by Sir Horace Plunkett—the Vice-President of the Department. Who was Sir Horace Plunkett? He had written a book for the advantage of those who wished to criticise him, in which he told the people of Ireland all about their lack of moral courage, independence and self-reliance, their excessive and extravagant church building, and their anti-economic religion; but these things could be passed by to-day as he had no desire to say anything to injure the literary skill that was strong enough to inspire the Rev. James O'Donovan, from London, W. to fill the *Daily Chronicle* of yesterday with his recollections of Loughrea—though in part only. Sir Horace Plunkett was a Unionist Member of the House of Commons from 1892 to 1900. He was still a Unionist, and it was not his fault that he was not a Member also. He was defeated in South Dublin, in 1900, as a Unionist candidate, and a few years later even the ancient city of Galway, so varying in the character of its political affections, would have nothing to do with the philanthropic Unionist, and elected a gentleman, who, if he had acted more consistently, might now be in the running for a position in Ireland that had already been secured by his confederate General Botha in the Transvaal. Anyhow, with all the power of the Department behind him, and used by him, with his way paved with good intentions, smoothed by the attentions of the uncles and friends of his staff, and guarded by Scottish professors, he remained without a seat in Parliament when the present Government came into office in 1906. He was then a Unionist and was still a Unionist. He subscribed to the funds of the Unionist candidate for South Dublin. No doubt he still thought of the way to make the Irish people cease to dream of Home Rule, and within the last few days the mischief-makers of the daily press—the *Daily Mail*, the *Globe*, the *Pall Mall Gazette*—had all joined their voices with the Tory Belfast Chamber of Commerce, the Ulster Liberal Unionist Alliance, the Sien Fein newspaper in Ireland, and the Rev. James O'Donovan, now in society and no longer of Loughrea, to keep the Unionist politician in a Ministerial office in a Liberal Government. In the absolutely united opinion of the Irish Nationalist Members the Liberal Government had kept him there too long. He often heard it said at home that whatever Government was in office in this country, the Tories were in power in Ireland. This transaction and some others gave colour to that statement. When Sir Horace Plunkett accepted the position of Vice-President in 1899, Mr. Gerald Balfour and everybody else down to the London *Times* declared that it was a Ministerial office. Sir Horace Plunkett himself, in his speech after the defeat in South Dublin and also in his book, declared the office to be a political and Ministerial one. He should have gone therefore with the Tory Government in 1906; and the mysterious correspondence with Mr. Bryce, the setting up of a Committee of Inquiry that nobody asked for, and the introduction on it of Mr. Dryden from Canada, outside the jurisdiction, as Mr. Birrell had said some time ago, were all acts of a most objectionable kind to retain a Tory politician in a Liberal Government. What would the Liberal Party think of an arrangement to retain Lord Halsbury in office on the ground that his work for his family was not yet completed, or that a Committee of Inquiry was sitting to inquire into the intellectual capacity of his successor? They would not stand it, and the Liberal Member for Bow and Bromley would never dream of putting on the Notice Paper, as he had done on this matter, a defence of Lord Halsbury. When on March 13th, 1906, Mr. Bryce was asked about the retention of Sir Horace Plunkett he stated that the arrangement was a purely provisional one, and he hoped to give it some thought within the next few months. While Mr. Bryce was thinking he asked Sir Horace Plunkett to be silent in the expression of his political opinions;

but when six months had gone by, Mr. Bryce changed his ground somewhat, and in reply to a Question stated that no decision had yet been arrived at and the whole question was under the consideration of the Committee of Inquiry. The question could never be under the consideration of a Committee of Inquiry, and when Mr. Bryce sailed away over the waters of the broad Atlantic he trimmed his sails peculiarly and left behind him a variety of Commissions, a pious opinion about the Irish language, a plan for a University, and a Unionist politician in the person of Sir Horace Plunkett in a Ministerial office, to which no claim or title could possibly be made for him. The Prime Minister, who was always candid and courteous upon Irish matters, said at the end of last year that there never was any intention of converting an office of one character into an office of another character. The present Chief Secretary quoted this approvingly in the discussion raised by the hon. Member for East Mayo the other day, and he added that the Committee of Inquiry had nothing to do with the matter whatever. What Irish Nationalists wanted to know was when was it to be disposed of? Sir Horace Plunkett might be all that his devoted admirers and most expectant followers claimed him to be, but he was as much a Unionist as the Member for North Armagh or Trinity College; he had only a different style. Technical education, co-operation, agricultural organisation, and all those other things were very nice sounding, but they could proceed on wrong lines. They lost much of their attractiveness for Irishmen when they saw that public money was used in connection with them, professedly not to drain the Bann or the Barrow, but to drain the national sentiment of the people. They knew, of course, that that was impossible, but they took their stand on the principle that the industrial revival could only go hand in hand with the national movement. It might be very fine to call up from different parts of Ireland a large council, but they wanted them when they were called to engage in some better work than when their day was occupied by Professor Campbell, at the suggestion of Sir Horace Plunkett on a recent occasion, lecturing them on "The Abstract Merits of Tillage and Grass." If money was to be spent on education the Irish people were claiming that the primary system should be first dealt with before they could have the proper ground work for technical training. But that evening they asserted, and it could not be contradicted, that Sir Horace Plunkett was a Unionist ex-Member of Parliament, and the occupant of a Parliamentary and Ministerial office in a Liberal Government, and they asked with a united voice and with some feeling, how long was this anomaly to be continued? They expected and they demanded a definite statement from the Chief Secretary to the Motion which he begged to move.

MR. MOONEY (Newry), in seconding, said that the Motion was put down by the Irish National Party and could in no way be taken as a personal attack on Sir Horace Plunkett. What they were attacking was the retention of his present office by Sir Horace Plunkett. Since the Motion had been placed upon the Paper they had noticed with curiosity but without surprise a very carefully engineered newspaper campaign on behalf of the present occupant of the office of Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture in Ireland. There was a curious similarity about the articles, and they were all careful and skilful pieces of special pleading. They were all most eulogistic defences of Sir Horace Plunkett and his policy, with which the Motion had nothing to do. The Motion made a clear and definite statement that this was a Parliamentary office. The answer that appeared in most of these newspaper articles was that it was not a Parliamentary office and that the gentleman who now occupied it was not a Minister of the Crown. It was not often that Irishmen relied on such authorities as he would presently quote, but in this case he thought they must be regarded at all events by the official opposition as standard authorities. The first authority was *The Times*, and the second the Leader of the Opposition, the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for the City. The origin of the position now held by Sir Horace Plunkett was to be found in the Report of what was called the Recess Committee, which recommended that this department should consist of a Board with a Minister of Agriculture and Industries responsible to Parliament at its head, assisted by a Council. On that recommendation Mr. Gerald Balfour brought in the Irish Agricultural and Technical Industries Bill. That Bill distinctly exempted the Minister appointed to this position from seeking re-election if he were a Member of the House, clearly showing that this was to be a Ministerial appointment. And so it was considered by Sir Horace Plunkett, who on the result of the South Dublin election made a speech in which he admitted, and in fact stated distinctly, that his political career as regarded that constituency was at an end as well as his public career as head of a public department. The next day *The Times*, commenting on the election wrote—

> "Mr. Plunkett's position as vice-president of the Department of Agriculture is not one which can well be held permanently by one who is not a Member of Parliament."

During the Parliament of 1900–1906 the position of Sir Horace Plunkett was vigorously assailed by Irish Members, not of the Party to which he had the honour to belong. There seemed to be some doubt as to whether Sir Horace Plunkett was or was not a person who ought to go out with a change of Government, and the hon. Member for South Donegal put a long question on the Paper asking for a definition of Sir Horace Plunkett's position. The first Question asked was whether the Vice-President would go out if the Ministry retired, and the answer was in the affirmative. It was undoubtedly the desire of the Government that the Vice-President should be a Member of the House, and he thought that it would be more convenient that it should be so, seeing that the late Government had undoubtedly recognised what they had maintained all along, that the moment that the late Government went out of office Sir Horace Plunkett, *ipso facto*, ceased to be a Member of the Government. That also proved that he was a Minister of the Crown. And there was another person who recognised it, and that was Sir Horace Plunkett himself. The Government went out of office in December last, and Sir Horace Plunkett issued a letter to the officials of his department stating that in consequence of the retirement from office of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London, he would meet the officials of the department on a certain day and say "good-bye," as he would have to vacate his position. Shortly afterwards they learned with some astonishment that Sir Horace Plunkett had been reappointed to the position of Vice-President. Questions were asked in the House about what his actual position was. Sir Horace Plunkett was not a Minister nor was he an ordinary civil servant, and what they wanted to know was how it came about that a statutory office had been turned into a non-statutory office, and how a Minister of the Crown became a permanent official who yet was not a civil servant. They had been asked, "why bring forward the Motion?" The answer was very simple. In 1900 Sir Horace Plunkett intimated to the Government that he recognised that he had to resign. But that was shortly after the passing of the Act in 1899, and Sir Horace added that owing to the confusion which would exist in the change he was quite willing to help the Government—it was the Government of his own Party—to take them temporarily out of the difficulty. He took them out of that difficulty for six years. Then a Liberal Government came into power, and they were told that Sir Horace Plunkett had resumed office to take the Liberal Government out of a temporary difficulty. And the suggestion was now made, after the Government had been in office for a year, and had on the stocks a Bill dealing with Irish Government, by which it was quite possible that the Department over which Sir Horace Plunkett presided might be abolished, that he was going to retain his position temporarily until the Irish Bill was introduced. When were these temporary appointments going to be made permanent, or when were the permanent appointments going to be made temporary? This had now been going for seven years, and each time there was a change a new reason was put forward by somebody why the office should be held temporarily. The next point was that Sir Horace Plunkett, from the nature of his office, ought to be in that House. The Agriculture Department was not a small one; its ramifications in every division of Irish life were extraordinary. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had yet had time to become acquainted with all the numerous Boards of which he was the head, but when they asked questions about the Department of Agriculture, the right hon. Gentleman was merely, he did not use the word offensively, the gramophone of some clerk in a back office in Dublin. They were entitled to have before them, as was intended by the Act of Parliament, the Government representative of the Department sitting on the Treasury Bench to respond to questions. Sir Horace Plunkett, if he chose, might seek a seat in that House, if he could find a constituency. He was perfectly certain that Sir Horace Plunkett was now and would remain a politician and a strong opponent of the present Government. Sir Horace Plunkett could seek election, and if returned there were two courses open to him. He could sit on the Treasury bench and answer questions as a Member of the Government, and make speeches attacking the Liberal Party. As a Unionist, he could, as a responsible Member of the Government, rise in his place beside his colleagues and denounce their policy. He could sit on the front Opposition bench, between the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin and the right hon. Gentleman the member for Dublin University, and from there answer questions on behalf of the Government. He did not think that such a situation of things was ever contemplated; it would be ridiculous. The right hon. Gentleman no doubt in his reply would refer to articles and Resolutions with reference to Sir Horace Plunkett. The articles were principally in such papers as the *Daily Mail*, the *Globe*, and the *Spectator*, and the Resolutions in his favour came from such strictly non-Party organisations as the Belfast Chamber of Commerce, who were non-political in the sense of the Tariff Reform League, and the Ulster Liberal Unionist Association. He wondered if the right hon. Gentleman knew anything about that association, or had ever seen a representative of that august body. He understood that this representative body consisted of about half a dozen gentlemen, eminently respectable, who met together for luncheon, and when they had finished it, had their coffee and cigars in the smoke room and, suffused by a feeling of general good-will towards all men, drafted their resolutions and spoke as the Ulster Liberal Unionist Association. The only other point was that unless something was done at once they were afraid that this office, intended by Parliament to be a Parliamentary position, would become merely another of those Irish Boards out of which they could get no information, and from which the Chief Secretary was not able to get any adequate explanation. They feared that instead of having a Department identified with the whole country and responsible to that House, there would simply be added another to that large number of costly and extravagant Boards at work in Ireland, responsible to nobody, and over whom nobody had any real control. He begged to second the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the position of Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture in Ireland was intended by Parliament to be and in fact is a Ministerial and Parliamentary office, properly vacated upon a change of Government, and that the retention of that office by a political opponent of the Government of the day is undesirable as a permanent arrangement."—(*Mr. Murphy.*)

*MR. BROOKE (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley) moved as an Amendment "That, in view of the continued confidence expressed in the policy of Sir Horace Plunkett by the Council of Agriculture, two-thirds of whose members are directly appointed by the county councils of Ireland, it is inadvisable, before the House has had an opportunity of considering carefully the Report of the committee of inquiry into the organisation and working of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, to make any change in Sir Horace Plunkett's tenure of the Vice-Presidency." He said that he did not bring this Amendment forward in any spirit of hostility to hon. Members sitting on the Nationalist Benches. He had been a Home Ruler longer than many hon. Members opposite, and although the mover of the Resolution seemed to think it was somewhat extraordinary that a Liberal Member should have a conviction different from that of the general body of Nationalists, he would not be at all surprised if the Nationalist Members upon some subjects held an opinion different from that of the general body ot Liberals. Therefore he thought he had a right to express his own convictions. He congratulated both the mover and seconder upon the moderation with which they had stated their case, and he hoped to state his views with equal moderation. He opposed this Resolution on two grounds. The first was that Members of Parliament, whether Unionist, Labour or Liberal, were being asked to pledge themselves to a certain course of action before a Committee which was inquiring into the subject had reported to the House. There had been a change since his Amendment in the form of words put forward in the Resolution, and instead of being asked to agree to a speedy termination of Sir Horace Plunkett's present tenure of office they were only asked to pledge themselves that it should not be a permanent arrangement. Why should all Members of Parliament be asked to pledge themselves to a definite conclusion on this question now? Why should they not be allowed to consider the Report first? He always understood that Blue-books were meant to be read and were intended to influence the minds of those who read them. Why should they not be allowed even to read this Blue-book which would go into the whole question of the working and organisation of the Department of Agriculture, before they came to a definite conclusion? He thought that proceeding was a little high-handed. Sir Horace Plunkett was no mere figure head, for he permeated the whole Department, and though the Report on his great work would be issued in a very short time, this Motion had been brought forward now. He protested against such action. He would protest against it even if Sir Horace Plunkett was out of the question, or even if a Liberal Government brought forward such a Motion when a Blue-book dealing with the subject of their Motion was ready to be issued. Under other circumstances he was sure Nationalist Members would make the same protest. After listening to the speeches of the mover and seconder of the Resolution he failed to comprehend why hon. Members opposite were in such an extreme hurry to deprive the House of the right of fair and free consideration of this question. No one denied that the Act of 1899 provided that the Vice-President should not be incapable of sitting as a Member of Parliament. But to say that he might sit was not the same as saying that he must. And, whatever the intentions of the framers of the Act were, they had certainly exercised no compulsion on either the present or the late Government. Both had transgressed their intentions lightly for nearly seven years. Was it not a little odd that a Party, which had fought so often against British Acts, should now be displaying such unwonted zeal for this Act — or rather its declared intentions? After all, Acts were often modified in practice and by special circumstances. His second objection to the Motion was that the county councils of Ireland to whose representatives on the Irish Council of Agriculture Sir Horace Plunkett was responsible, had never asked for his dismissal from his post. These councils were ardently Nationalist, yet they seemed satisfied with the position of the head of the Department. Why, then, should Liberals do what the county councils had never asked should be done? The Resolution proposed that they should get rid of him as a political opponent of the present Government. That was scarcely a proposition that should commend itself to Liberals. The county councils were represented on the Council of Agriculture in the proportion of sixty-eight to thirty-four nominated members, thus outnumbering the nominated members by two to one. So that, if this widespread dissatisfaction really existed, the Council of Agriculture could make it plain whenever they pleased. As the county council representatives had never asked him to resign, he assumed that they had not looked upon this as a political appointment, but they regarded it as a business appointment, and looked upon him as, on the whole, the right man in the right place. On a recent occasion, when there was a desire on the part of Sir Horace to embark more fully on the co-operative principle, his policy had been strikingly confirmed. At that meeting in November last there was an opportunity for the Council of Agriculture to vote against Sir Horace Plunkett and his whole administration if they had wished to do so. They had a majority of two to one over the nominated members. The policy had been declared six months before, during which time they could have consulted every county council and taken instructions and could then have come back in November to overwhelm Sir Horace Plunkett and the nominated members together. What was the result? The result was the triumph of his policy by a vote of fifty-two to twenty-five. He was told that that triumph would still have taken place if not one of the nominated members had voted on the Resolution. The Council of Agriculture had not asked for the dismissal of Sir Horace Plunkett for political or any other reasons. That was a matter which this House should take into consideration. He was one of those Liberals who were very jealous of the rights of local authorities. He thought they were restricted and hampered by the Imperial Parliament far too much. He was in favour of Home Rule for Ireland and also Home Rule for the local authorities. Therefore, he did not think the House should be rushed to declare itself in a matter about which the county councils had not yet spoken. Let the councils have a chance of deciding first as to Sir Horace Plunkett. They had not declared against him and his administration. Why should they, as Liberals, overpower the local authorities? Personally he regretted that this Motion had been brought forward. He thought it was obvious enough that the whole question must come up on the Devolution Bill which the Government had promised. He failed to see why the question was not left over till the Bill was brought forward. The Motion having been made, he, as one who had a warm regard for Sir Horace Plunkett and his splendid work, had nothing left for him to do but to protest against it. He begged to move.

*SIR F. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.), in seconding the Amendment, acknowledged the exceedingly temperate tone of the speeches made in support of the Motion, and especially that of the hon. Member for Newry, who based his argument on constitutional grounds. But what they had really to consider was not so much a string of political perplexities based on elaborate hypotheses, but the plain fact that this was a Motion to humiliate and practically to order the immediate resignation of, perhaps, the one man who had been the best friend of Ireland—[cheers and NATIONALIST cries of "No"]—in his endeavours to bring together the best minds of Ireland, of whatever political complexion and of whatever creed, to work for the common good of the country. He contended that a man who had done that deserved well of his country and of the House, and his fellow-countrymen should not insist on inflicting on him such an uncalled-for humiliation. Rightly or wrongly, Sir Horace Plunkett had been invited by the responsible Minister of the Crown to continue in his office, because his genius and enthusiasm had created the office and the work it was doing, and would materially help in completing the inquiry now in progress and in helping the Government to secure the best results from that inquiry. It was impossible for any Government not to recognise the services rendered by Sir Horace Plunkett in initiating agricultural and social reforms, and the man who had shown his qualities deserved the full, kindly, and generous consideration of the House. He said that with a full heart, because a small handful of men in this country, of whom he was one, had studied Sir Horace's ideas and reforms and had endeavoured in their own way to introduce similar methods of organisation in England. They had tried also, as Sir Horace Plunkett had, to banish from the discussion of agricultural and social reforms that hateful and detestable spirit of political and Party animosity which paralysed the best energies of men for useful objects. It was plain from the facts within their knowledge that Sir Horace Plunkett's conduct was absolutely correct. He had offered and expected to withdraw, and it was in the face of those facts that Mr. Bryce in explicit terms invited Sir Horace Plunkett to set aside the usual considerations of Party and to retain his office, and, indeed, insisted on his doing so, in order that the Government might have his support and help in the completion of their work. No one could challenge his sincere and resolute support of the Irish cause. He spoke as a convinced Home Ruler whose opinions had in no way changed. He welcomed the project of a Devolution Bill with all his heart, but he hoped the Government would not assent to this Motion. He thought it would be well for them to consider that it was an ill-omened prelude to the policy of devolution, a policy which would only bring good to Ireland and the United Kingdom if it was entered upon in a spirit of mutual consideration and fair play as between the different political sections and religious creeds in Ireland. It was only by the adoption of that spirit of conciliation which Sir Horace Plunkett taught and tried to carry out that the best results could be obtained, and he thought the Government would be ill-advised when starting on their policy in joining with hon. Members opposite in inflicting humiliation on a man who had initiated the principles which should govern such a policy.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from 'that,' to end and insert 'in view of the continued confidence expressed in the policy of Sir Horace Plunkett by the Council of Agriculture, two-thirds of whose members are directly appointed by the county councils of Ireland, it is inadvisable, before the House has had an opportunity of considering carefully the Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the organisation and working of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, to make any change in Sir Horace Plunkett's tenure of the Vice-Presidency."—(*Mr. Brooke.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said there was no one who would not recognise the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire as a consistent and faithful friend of Ireland. When the hon. Member made such a strong appeal to the Nationalist Members to consent to the retention in office of a man who, no matter what else could be said of him, was a Minister of the Crown and yet belonged to a Party opposed to the Ministry, he would ask him to apply the same method to his own Party. The hon. Member and himself had been colleagues in the days of strain and storm and stress, but great as was his admiration for him he said with all respect that even he assumed the habit, somewhat irritating to Irishmen, of lecturing them from the high and lofty pinnacle of British intelligence without ever applying the same principles to himself. Conciliation no doubt was a noble principle. But on the same principle, why was the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin not sitting on the Treasury Bench? He was a respectable and honourable man. They were all honourable men in this House. They were all as honourable as Sir Horace Plunkett. Why was not the hon. Member for Dulwich, if the Liberal Party carried this argument to its logical conclusion, at the Board of Trade? In spite of all the eulogies poured upon Sir Horace Plunkett from the Liberal Benches, the fact remained that he had searched all over Ireland for many years and had been unable to find one constituency to accept him. He tried first as a Unionist, then as a politician of no colour at all, but it had the same result. If his services to Ireland had been so magnificent as represented, then no more ungrateful people than the Irish people could be found. He would not discuss the work of the Agricultural Department on that occasion, but he held that it had been very far indeed from being a complete success. He would go further and say that the comparative failure of the work of the Department had been in a large measure due to the personality of Sir Horace Plunkett as well as to the constitution he forced upon it. Since its foundation £2,000,000 had been spent upon it, but the amount of practical work which the Department had to show for that vast expenditure was positively ludicrous. If the Irish people controlled the management of their own affairs a Department to take care of agriculture would be of incalculable value to the Irish people. But the present Department had made a stupendous blunder in undertaking too much. In a practical administration of such a Department far greater value could be obtained for the money spent. The question was simply whether a Parliamentary pledge embodied in a statute was to be observed or set aside in the interest of an individual, or whether Sir Horace Plunkett was to be allowed to continue to use the vast machinery of patronage at his disposal as a means of carrying on a political propaganda hostile to the national movement. They were not pleading for the observance of an English statute because it was an English statute, but for the observance of an English statute as a pledge given them at their request as a Ministerial bargain. It had been said that Sir Horace Plunkett had kept aloof from politics and that he enjoyed the confidence of the Irish people as against the confidence of the Irish Party, in proof of which it was said that he obtained a vote of confidence from the Agricultural Council. As to the first statement, there was not a shadow of foundation for it; and no question of confidence had been submitted to the Council. The question was submitted whether a vote of money should be given to a body called the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, and out of the fifty-two who voted for it thirty were the nominees of Sir Horace Plunkett, and it was proposed and seconded by men who had a financial interest in the transaction. Of the independent men present an overwhelming majority were opposed to the grant. It would be ludicrous to accept the voice of such a body against the voice of the representatives of Ireland. It was said that Sir Horace Plunkett had never been a politician. That was an absolute falsehood. If it were true, as stated by the hon. Member opposite, that Sir H. Plunkett was a man who, apart from all political motives, had given a long life to the welfare of the unhappy people of Ireland, what ground or motive could the Nationalist Party have for making this Motion, or raising this question at all? Sir Horace Plunkett was appointed to his present post as a politician. He first met the hon. Gentleman in 1891, when he had just returned from America. Sir Horace sent him a message asking permission to call upon him. Previous to that he had never heard of the gentleman. He came and spent two hours with him; he told him that though he had been long absent from Ireland, and belonged to the landlord class, he was absolutely without political feeling, that he loved the Irish people and wished to devote his life to them, and to keep aloof from political Parties. He told Sir Horace that to keep aloof from Irish politics was an impossible task, and that he could not expect that he could in any great degree alleviate the condition of the people of Ireland until he became a politician. He said to him that if he could keep clear of politics he would have his best wishes for his success. That was in 1891. Afterwards Sir Horace Plunkett got himself nominated by Mr. Balfour as a Member of the Congested Districts Board, as a non-politician, and obtained admission to their circles, which included Catholic priests and Nationalists, and within one short year after Sir Horace Plunkett had given him that pledge he made his famous campaign in South Dublin and stole from the Nationalist Party one of their most valued seats as an avowed Unionist. That was a memory which was not likely to fade from his mind. Sir Horace Plunkett then appeared as the Member for South Dublin and made some bitter and sneering speeches in the House against the Nationalists. In the course of his campaign he made a speech in Belfast in which he said that he was agitating for this agricultural department and declared that his mission in Ireland was to disinfect Irish life of politics, and he (Mr. Dillon) supposed of politicians too. What he meant by disinfecting Irish life of politics apparently was to disinfect it of Nationalist politics. That was indeed the only sense in which the word politics was used in Ireland. The Unionist politics were not politics apparently. Then Sir Horace Plunkett's next step—and it was a scheme which he had always admired as a politician for its extreme astuteness—was to enter into an agreement with Mr. Gerald Balfour to kill Home Rule with kindness. It had been alleged that it was in order to do that that the Department of Agriculture was placed under his control. It was also alleged on the other side of the question that at the elections he was attacked by the Orange Party and consequently lost his seat in Dublin through that attack; but that was not true, because his hon. friend the Member for Newry on that occasion did great service to his country by winning the seat for the Nationalists. There was, however, some truth in the statement that the political career of Sir Horace Plunkett was cut short by the Orange Party; but why did the Orange Party attack him? Because the Orange Party in Ireland was invariably the stupid one. They were unable on that occasion, as they always were, to recognise their true friends, and when they rejected Sir Horace Plunkett they threw away a wise Unionist statesman and one of the most formidable Unionist statesmen of the present time. It was not members who interrupted him in that House that they had to fight against, but men like Sir Horace Plunkett, who had some ideas in their heads. The Orange Party were stupid, because they failed to recognise that he was the best friend to the Unionist Party that they had had in Ireland for the last half-century. The next step in Sir Horace Plunkett's career was his attempt to get back to Parliament as the representative of Galway. On the day before he started for Galway, in an interview with the Dublin correspondent of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, he said—

> "I have in my power large patronage in Ireland; I have been attacked by the Orange Party because I gave the Nationalists a share, but I intend to pursue that course."

That was the substance of Sir Horace Plunkett's statement. While Nationalist seats were attacked he deliberately stated that he had large patronage, and would see that the Nationalists were not left out. He had never attributed mean or sordid motives to Sir Horace Plunkett, as Father O'Donovan insinuated; he believed he was a man of large means, who spent his salary on his work. He had the greatest possible admiration for his ability—he would go further, and say for his motives, too—for he was a Unionist, and had consistently pursued for years the only policy which had a gleam of hope of defeating Nationalist policy in Ireland. But his ambition was to weaken and destroy the Nationalist Party, who stood for the Nationalist cause and liberty to Ireland. [Mr. LONSDALE: A very good work too.] A very good work, too, said the Member of Mid Armagh. That brief speech was of value to them. Sir Horace Plunkett had been throughout his career a politician; he was a Unionist, and an implacable enemy to the Nationalist Party and the cause they stood for. It was a scandal and disgrace, now that a Government were in power who were friendly to the cause they were fighting for, that they should retain such a man in office at the head of vast machinery in Ireland, and that he should be at liberty to maintain, as he did, a band of agents going through Ireland, paid by the taxpayers, to blackguard and abuse the Members on those benches, and to subsidise out of the taxpayers' money a scurrilous newspaper, whose chief business was to sneer at Home Rule. These were the grounds on which they objected to Sir Horace Plunkett's retention of office.

*MR. BUTCHER (Cambridge University) said the debate began with a high constitutional argument on the part of Members below the gangway—it exhibited their love of correct Parliamentary precedent. The House was assured that the debate was to be continued on those lines—the insistence on full Parliamentary control, on which they knew the hearts of the Nationalist Party had always been set, and the observance of an Act of Parliament. The hon. Gentleman, however, who had just spoken, had imported an entirely different tone into the debate; they had heard a most impassioned denunciation of the whole career of Sir Horace Plunkett. The only good word that had been said for him was that he was a man with ideas, and that he was, therefore, one of the most formidable enemies of Ireland. It would seem that he had entered into some dark conspiracy against the liberties of Ireland, and that he was simply a bitter politician under the guise of a social reformer. The hon. Gentleman, in support of this view of Sir Horace Plunkett, pointed back to sixteen years during which he had know him. He himself had known Sir Horace Plunkett for a much longer period; he had watched his work with quite as much impartiality as the hon. Member for East Mayo, and was amazed at the description of this "bitter, sneering Unionist." He would not at that hour go into questions which after all were not connected with the Motion before the House, but would confine himself to the most relevant issues in a discussion which had covered so much ground. There were two governing facts in the situation. The first was that Sir Horace Plunkett, at the express desire of the Government, still held office; and, secondly, that he held office pending the result of an inquiry into the constitution and working of the Department instituted by the Government themselves. The Report of the Committee was expected in a few weeks. The motive, therefore, of this debate would seem to be to pledge the Government before they had seen the Report of their own Committee to a certain course of action from which they could not afterwards recede. The Government had already made a pronouncement on another matter of large policy before the evidence of their own Commission had been published, and he did not believe they would again commit so great an error. He fully admitted that the constitutional question whether the Vice-President should or should not be a Member of the House was a proper question to raise. To his mind very strong arguments could be brought both for and against. But was it not reasonable to say to the Government: "Do not pledge yourselves to-day; wait for the evidence; read the Report; review the situation in the light of that Report; and do not make a binding promise because of the Parliamentary pressure which has been put upon you this evening"? He was perfectly free to admit that the position of the Vice-President was an anomalous position. There was no doubt that the intention of the Legislature was that the holder of the office should have a seat in Parliament. On the other hand, the words of the Act did not make it obligatory, and when the Member for Mayo spoke of the violation of the statute he did not think if he had the words before him he would have used such a phrase.

MR. DILLON: I did not speak of violation of the statute; I spoke of the violation of the Ministerial pledge—a very different thing.

*MR. BUTCHER begged the hon. Gentleman's pardon; he had understood him to make both statements. However, it was true that there had been, not indeed a Parliamentary pledge, but a Parliamentary understanding that the office was to carry with it a seat in Parliament. But they all knew what had happened. In 1900 the Vice-President lost his seat and was retained in office by the Government of the day. He was so continued with the practical assent of all Parties in Ireland, and after a memorial had been signed by 15,000 or 20,000 people, expressing the hope that he would not be deposed from office. The House ought to understand that at the time Sir Horace Plunkett definitely said, and had repeated it several times during the past six or seven years, that he would not retain office one single day after he had ceased to retain the confidence of the representative bodies through which and with which he worked. The hon. Member for East Mayo had made very light of the Agricultural Council. He (Mr. Butcher) could only say of that Council that, like other boards with which Sir Horace Plunkett worked, two-thirds of it was composed of members who were popularly elected or represented popularly-elected bodies, and that Sir Horace had been supported by those bodies in every important matter of policy which he had brought forward. It had been said that the retention of Sir Horace Plunkett in office during the last six years was all wrong. He maintained the very opposite. It had turned out to be to the great public advantage of Ireland. In the first place, the office was a new one. The Department had to be created. Its work, its method, its plan of operations—everything had to be organised. No permanent officials existed; there were no precedents to follow; and it seemed advisable that during those experimental years the man in whose brain the whole idea originated should be responsible for controlling, directing, and guiding the movement. Moreover, after the initial stages there was a very great expansion of the work. All kinds of new problems arose, and it became almost necessary that the whole time and thought of the Vice-President should be devoted to his duties on the spot. It was very doubtful whether the work of the Department would not have suffered if Sir Horace's time and attention had been distracted by attendance in the House of Commons. There was a distinct gain in the titular head during those years being also the real head of the Department. That was one reason in favour of his retention. In the second place, everybody in Ireland, excepting the hon. Member for East Mayo, admitted that if Sir Horace Plunkett was a politician, he was of all politicians the least political. Beyond doubt he had held the scales evenly, and very often to his own disadvantage as a party man. He had shown impartiality in the manning of his office. He had alienated the sympathy of his friends by putting in Nationalists. Throughout his administration there had been the same absence of party bias. His own party popularity had suffered, but the cause of Ireland had gained. It was to that impartiality, that marked impartiality, that the success of the Department had been in large measure due. Any taint of political favouritism would have made it impossible for him to carry on that work with all that great network of technical and other committees with which his Department was concerned. The truth was that everybody in Ireland knew that Sir Horace Plunkett had no Party or personal ends to serve—that he was detached from everything except what he believed to be the welfare of his country. In Ireland there was no lack of political speech, there was a lack of economic thought. Men there were in plenty who would talk about Ireland; but those who were working for Ireland were but few. Sir Horace Plunkett was one of the few—the leader of the few; he was not talking, but doing, or rather he had done great work already, though it was small in comparison with the promise that lay within it of future achievement. He was teaching the people the lesson of self-help and self-reliance; the lesson that even a little which they could do for themselves was worth far more than a great deal which was done for them by Government. He had to face the opposition of various interests. He had gone on his way fearlessly and steadily, heedless of praise or blame, strong in the conviction of a true idea, and looking forward to no reward beyond the hope of leaving his country a little better than he found it. The group of men he had gathered round him in that work was remarkable. His office staff was composed of men of different politics, but all were inspired by the same zeal and devotion as himself. They had caught the spirit of their chief, and were animated by a common ideal. Here, then, they had one man who, not by talking but by doing, had proved himself to be eminently fitted for a particular non-political work. Was he to be made use of? Or was he to be cast aside because he was not enough of a politician? The question was not a personal question. It was one of economics and industry *versus* politics. Which was to prevail? That was the ultimate issue. There was in Ireland a growing body of thoughtful men who desired to build up the economic life of the people on a non-party foundation. They asked that one Department at least, whoever was in office, Sir Horace Plunkett or a successor, should be rescued from politics and conducted on broader and more hopeful lines. The reasons why he opposed this Motion and supported the Amendment were, first, that the Motion prejudged the questions now before the Committee of Inquiry. It left no freedom to the Government. It pledged them beforehand to a certain course of action. And, secondly, it must, under existing circumstances—emphasised, moreover, by the strange speech they had heard from the Member for East Mayo—be taken as a censure, or at least a slur, on the conduct of a very distinguished public servant. If, on looking at the matter all round, and after due inquiry, the Government came to the conclusion that the Vice-President should henceforth be a party man, responsible directly to that House, many of them would profoundly regret the decision, but they would still recognise that the case had been considered on its merits. It was quite another thing to foreclose and prejudge the matter in the way now proposed. The case was too grave for that, and the interests involved were too large. On the personal point, however, once more let it be said that Sir Horace Plunkett did not cling to office. He held office for two reasons—first, at the express desire of the Government; and, secondly, because he had had, and still could claim, the unbroken support of the Irish representative bodies with whom and through whom he worked. The mere emoluments of office he did not covet. Indeed, he gave back, he believed, to Ireland, for the purposes of his Department, every penny he received as salary. Doubtless he had been bitterly assailed, and they had had a specimen of it that night. But many quiet observers in Ireland, and many more in this country and in America, had watched Sir Horace Plunkett's work with silent admiration, and recognised him to be the most single-hearted and disinterested of politicians, and the greatest public benefactor that had arisen in Ireland in our generation.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he regarded this debate as one of so serious a character that he thought it ought not to close without his saying something. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had said that this Motion was designed with the object of getting the Government to prejudge the issue, but the only issue raised was as to whether the post of Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture was or was not a Parliamentary office, and no such issue as that was submitted in the reference to the Committee which was now sitting. Unless something extraordinary happened—as was often the case in Irish affairs—when the Report of the Committee was issued it would be found that to this question there would be no reference whatever made by the Committee. This was not a Motion to attack Sir Horace Plunkett's work or his personality, and there was not one word in the Motion censuring him as an inefficient officer or declaring his work to be bad. The Motion raised the clear and simple issue whether this post was a Parliamentary office which ought to be vacated upon a change of Government, and whether it was expedient that an opponent of the Government should hold the office. His hon. friend the Member for East Mayo was able to speak with a freedom upon this matter which he could not claim, for this reason; he was one of those who associated themselves with Sir Horace Plunkett at the time of the formation of the Recess Committee, from whose Report the scheme of this Depment sprang, and he thought Sir Horace Plunkett himself would be the first to admit that, in all probability, that Recess Committee would never have met at all if he and his friends had refused to associate with him in the project. And, further, it was very probable that when the scheme came before that House for the creation of a Department of Agriculture, if he had opposed that scheme instead of supporting it, it would never have passed into law. Why did he approve of the Report of the Recess Committee and accept the measure for the creation of the Department of Agriculture? Upon certain essential conditions, the first and most essential of which was that the Minister appointed at the head of the Department was to hold a seat in that House and to be responsible for the Department as a Minister of the Crown upon the Treasury Bench. The hon. Member who had just spoken said that the Act constituting the Department used the word "may" sit in Parliament and not "shall."

*Mr. BUTCHER said he had not quoted the words of the Act, but the words were these—

> "The office of Vice-President of the Department shall not render the person holding the same incapable of being elected as a Member of Parliament."

Mr. JOHN REDMOND said the hon. Gentleman argued from that that there was no necessity for him to be a Member of the House. If he applied that doctrine to the gentlemen occupying the Treasury Bench at that moment it would be an absolute violation of the constitutional doctrine of the country that Ministers representing great Departments should sit in that House. He would not have assented to the passing of the Bill except on the distinct understanding that the Minister representing the Department was to have a seat in, and was to be responsible to, that House, and the continuance in office of a gentleman who had not a seat in the House was a breach of faith with those who passed the measure into law and a gross violation, as he contended, of constitutional usage. He did not ask the Government to censure Sir Horace Plunkett or to denounce his conduct in his office as inefficient. He asked them to declare that the position he now occupied was an anomalous, illogical, and untenable one, that it should be speedily changed, and that the pledges they had received from the Prime Minister and others that this was merely a temporary arrangement should be fulfilled.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): Before I say a word about the Amendment, and on the Motion, there is one thing I should like to make as plain as it is possible for words to make it, although I think it has already made itself pretty plain in the course of the debate, for, after all, fair play is a jewel in all parts of the United Kingdom. And that thing is that Sir Horace Plunkett is where he is at the present moment because of the request of the Irish Government. It may have been a wise step on the part of the Irish Government, or it may have been a foolish step, but it was their step, and not his. Sir Horace Plunkett is, by common consent—I am glad to say we are all agreed on this—a man in whose breast no sordid idea ever takes root, and he is the last man to cling to office. He was not only prepared to go, but it is common knowledge—he has himself told me that I am at liberty to make the statement to the House—that he fully expected that he was going and he would have gone had it not been that his departure was stayed at the request of my predecessor in office. Therefore, it would be impossible for me who have ratified the former acts of my predecessor to consent to any Motion which seemed to cast the faintest shadow of a suspicion or a doubt upon the right of Sir Horace Plunkett at the present moment to remain where he is. He is, as it were, our guest, and I would as soon think of inviting a man to dinner and then request him to leave the table before the last course was served, as I would of doing anything which would suggest that Sir Horace Plunkett was not perfectly entitled to be where he is at the present moment. Therefore, I think on that part of the case we have that satisfaction. The correspondence has been read before, but, as it is part of the case, I should like to remind the House as to what it was that Mr. Bryce wrote to Sir Horace Plunkett:—

"I have under consideration the arrangements necessary for continuing the duties of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction. I understand that, regarding your appointment as Vice-President of the Department as being of a political character, you are desirous of retiring from it at the change of Ministry. On this point I have consulted the Prime Minister and with his concurrence I conceive that it may be proper to treat the matter as being one which for our immediate purposes is outside considerations of Party. I therefore hope that you will be disposed, seeing that the arrangement is one of a purely provisional character, to carry on the duties of Vice-President. It is the intention of the Government to examine fully into the organisation and working of the Department and its relations to the other branches of Irish administration, and I think your continuance in the office of Vice-President will facilitate such examination. They retain, I need hardly say, entire freedom as to their future action."

On 21st February, 1906, the Prime Minister made the following reply to a Question—

"My view of the case is this—that the present state of things is purely temporary and purely exceptional. There is no intention of converting an office which is of one character into an office of another character with the same official serving in it. That has never been contemplated. But as the whole matter was under review in order to place the Department in many respects on a better footing, it was thought that there was no harm in continuing Sir Horace Plunkett in the position, rather than make a new appointment which would have to be subject to any change found to be necessary."

My predecessor was strongly of opinion that it was highly desirable to have an inquiry into the working of the Department. His reason—he is now a long way off, and therefore one can speak of him with some freedom—was that he had in preparation a measure of what is commonly called "devolution," and he was naturally very much attracted by the examples of successful devolution which had been carried into effect by the Act constituting this Department of Agriculture, which absorbed a considerable number of existing Boards and bodies, and created a Board and consultative Council, elected in a certain way by the Irish people, who were to exercise control over it. That is devolution, of course. That kind of devolution becomes law. Other kinds of devolution may meet with difficulties in other places. My right hon. friend was anxious to have a careful and searching inquiry into the working of the Department, partly for the reason that it would increase his knowledge and give him a good hint or two for his own measure, and also because complaints had been made in different parts of Ireland as to the working of the Department. My predecessor put upon the Committee certain gentlemen, one of great knowledge of technical education, connected with South Kensington, and another gentleman from Canada—an agricultural country. Unfortunately for that honest man, the first thing he said, on arriving in Ireland, was that he had derived great knowledge from Sir Horace Plunkett's interesting book, which he had been reading for information. But this Committee is a serious body, and will, no doubt, report in a short time—I hope before many days are over. They are now considering their final Report, and I protest against any suggestion that they are holding over that Report. They are doing nothing of the kind; but in consequence of the great pressure which I have put upon them, they have hurried their work on as fast as they conld, and, before many days are out, I am assured that Report will appear. Then the Government will give it their full consideration. The object for which Mr. Bryce sought to retain Sir Horace Plunkett was that he might give evidence before the Committee and put it in possession of all the information at his command. The understanding, therefore, was that he was to remain in office pending the result of the inquiry into his Department. It is quite a mistake to suppose that in this question — which is one of administration, and therefore essentially one for the Prime Minister—my right hon. friend was ever in doubt as to the course to be taken, or that he needed advice from gentlemen from Canada or others. It is the fixed intention of the Prime Minister that this office should be a Ministerial office, held by a Gentleman in sympathy with the Party in power, sitting here on these Benches, and responsible to the House for the work of his Department. Therefore, it is a mistake to suppose that we are waiting for the Report of this Committee in order to make up our minds upon the subject, for our minds are already completely made up and will in no way be affected, in that matter, by the inquiry into the working of the Department itself. As to the Parliamentary bargain, no one who has listened to the two moderate, able, and conclusive speeches of the mover and seconder of the Motion can have any doubt that there is an overwhelming case in its support, and no one can blame the Prime Minister or blame me for having determined to adhere to that Parliamentary bargain. It took its origin in the Report of the Recess Committee, which I understand is Sir Horace Plunkett's own Report. From beginning to end of that Report there is the assertion that the head of the Agricultural Department should be a Minister with a seat in the House of Commons. Sir Horace Plunkett is a man who was distinguished in this House, and everybody would be glad, apart from politics, to see him back again. And does anybody doubt that if he had been fortunate enough to retain his seat in Parliament he would, as Vice-President of the Agricultural Department, have remained in Parliament, and would have transacted his duties as a Minister just as admirably here as well as in Ireland? I quite agree that a man cannot be in two places at the same time; but the time which Sir Horace Plunkett would have given as a Minister to Parliament would not have been lost to Ireland. After all, Sir Horace Plunkett would be the last man to suggest, as has been suggested by his friends, that he is the Department. My hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University referred to the body of able and active men Sir Horace Plunkett has gathered round him in Ireland. Quite true; and these men would have done their business all the same though their chief was absent from Ireland in Parliament for a short time. In fact, I believe that if Sir Horace Plunkett had been here during the term of office of the late Administration to answer questions affecting the Department, the Department would not be covered with that cloud of suspicion which unfortunately now envelops it. The Irish Members would have had opportunities of conversing with him in the lobbies and in his room in the way they most cheerfully know how to exercise. My experience is that they are fair-minded men, and I think he would have been able to make good his case against them, even though he might give way to them in some cases against his better judgment. If people imagine that the administration of a great Department like this, with the ramifications and operations extending throughout all agricultural Ireland, can be carried on without the head of that Department being in touch with the Nationalist Party, with Irish Members, those sitting for Ulster as well as those representing other parts of Ireland, then they are greatly mistaken. Therefore it was that Mr. Gerald Balfour, whose absence from the House I greatly deplore—the more ex-Chief Secretaries there are in the House the better pleased I am; I always look to them for sympathy at least, if not for support—Mr. Gerald Balfour contested this very point in the House with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, and pointed out—I have the passage here, but I do not wish to read it—that as Chief Secretary he was a shadow or shade of the Department, but could not undertake its work. Now Mr. Gerald Balfour has left the tradition in the Chief Secretary's Office that he was the most hard-working and conscientious Minister in matters of detail the office had ever known. I am afraid I shall not interfere with the reputation he enjoys. He declined to make himself responsible for the work of the Department, and insisted that the intention was that the Vice-President should be a Member of the House. To that decision the present Government adhere. It is all very well for my hon. friend the Member for Cambridge University, who spoke so highly of the personal qualities of Sir Horace Plunkett, irrespective of Party, to refer to him as "the least political of politicians"—was that the phrase? I did not quite catch it, but I know it means something discreditable to politicians. I am not quite so sure that my hon. friend would be quite so satisfied with Sir Horace Plunkett's retention of office, if, instead of sharing so many of his opinions, he held a diametrically opposite opinion on one important subject. The "sweet reasonableness" of my hon. friend would scarcely swallow such a bolus as that; and he must not be surprised to find men on these Benches not quite so exalted in their views as my hon. friend, who would prefer that a great Department like this should be represented in the House by a Minister with whom other Members of the Administration have personal relations, and with whose views they sympathise. Well, the effect of it all is this. We wish it to be distinctly understood that Sir Horace Plunkett is where he is at the request of the Government, and that there is not a thought or a shadow of blame to be attached to him, for he would have gone but for our action and interference. We are waiting for the Report, which soon we shall get; but we have definitely and determinately made up our minds that the office shall be held in accordance with the original intention with which the Act was passed, not only by a Member of the House, but by a Member of the Administration, and from that view, and that intention we do not intend in any way to depart. We have, therefore, no difficulty in supporting the Motion of the hon. Gentleman opposite, which states the exact facts of the case. After all I would remind hon. friends behind me this is a Prime Minister's question. It is a question of administration. If he thinks his Administration will be strengthened and supported by the Parliamentary obligation being carried out, the House should wait to censure it until it has been done. We cannot support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bow and Bromley, but we can support the Motion of the hon. Member opposite.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): As one of the ex-Chief Secretaries who are the delight of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, I think I ought to say one word in this debate, especially as I was the ex-Chief Secretary who, in another capacity, was primarily responsible for assenting to the arrangement by which Sir Horace Plunkett continued out of Parliament the work he so admirably commenced in Parliament. This question has two aspects, an historical aspect and a personal aspect; and on the historical aspect I think there can be no dispute amongst hon. Gentlemen on either side of the House. It is perfectly true that this office was intended to be a Parliamentary appointment. It is also true, in my belief, that, as the present Chief Secretary for Ireland has said, Sir Horace Plunkett would have continued, during the tenure of office of the late Administration, his work on the Agricultural Board in this House had he succeeded in obtaining a seat in this House. He failed to obtain a seat in this House, and the question which arose and had to be decided by His Majesty's late advisers, was whether it was, or was not, for the interests of Ireland, and for the interests of the great industry of Ireland, that Sir Horace Plunkett should continue out of Parliament the functions which, no doubt, it was originally intended should be carried out by a Gentleman in this House. I believe that which is in fact the account of the historical situation given by the Chief Secretary, and I believe also by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, to be perfectly accurate. Why did the late Government decide that Sir Horace Plunkett should be asked to continue his work? They came to that decision because they were of opinion that there was no man in Ireland of any politics—politics did not enter into this particular part of the question at all—so qualified by his knowledge, by the aspirations which had guided his life, by the ideals which he always held before him, to carry the work of the new Department to a successful issue as the man who had so large a part—not, perhaps, the whole part—in framing it and bringing it into being. After all, Sir, from a merely personal point of view, from the point of view of the Government which has a great many friends who would like to have office and not many offices to give them, which is the difficulty of all Prime Ministers, it would, of course, have been convenient to have another vacancy to bestow upon some deserving Member of this House; and the reason we did not take that very simple and obvious course, the reason why we persuaded Sir Horace Plunkett to continue his work out of Parliament as he had begun it in Parliament, was that we believed that was for the best interests of Ireland. I am convinced that no man in this House who knows anything about Ireland will deny that the decision come to by the late Government, and endorsed by the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor, was, in the interests of Ireland, the right decision. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Leader of the Irish Party described the position of Sir Horace Plunkett as anomalous, illogical, and untenable. I think logic is very improperly and unhappily brought into this question. If by logic is meant an absolute consistency of policy, it has admittedly been broken in this case. It is perfectly true that Sir Horace Plunkett himself never anticipated when he took the office in Parliament that he would hold it when out of

Parliament; but if it was for the interest of Ireland, during the years that succeeded the election of 1900, that he should hold the office he has held, and continue to perform the great functions which he has performed to the admiration of everybody, why are we on this occasion to hold this close, pedantic view of continuity of policy, which is, of course, not backed up by any legal sanction, and has not behind it the sanction of any Act of Parliament? I think we were amply justified in the breach of logic of which the right hon. Gentleman complains; and the late Chief Secretary must have been of the same opinion, because he carried out a policy as anomalous, as illogical, as untenable as the policy for which we were responsible, and he did it for the same reason. I fail to understand the view taken by the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down of his predecessor's policy. The right hon. Gentleman appears to be of opinion that Sir Horace Plunkett was continued in office, not so much to do work for which he was peculiarly qualified, as in order that he might give evidence on a subject of which he knew a great deal. If it is illogical to carry out a policy which is untenable, let us, at all events, do it in a better cause than that of merely enabling a man to give evidence before a Royal Commission. Let us do it in order that we may effect a great reform, may carry out a great material work to the benefit of the Irish people. And I believe, in spite of the evidence of Mr. Bryce's successor, that that was Mr. Bryce's intention when he asked Sir Horace Plunkett to continue his duties. What evidence has come to the present Chief Secretary for Ireland which has made him change the opinion entertained by his predecessor and the predecessor of his predecessor? What view does he take of Sir Horace Plunkett's work which makes him doubt that the work of the Department could not be carried out so well by any other man? He has given us no suggestion, but he has assented—or rather he has, on the part of his Government, given his consent—to a Resolution which, however it is interpreted, is really susceptible of only one interpretation, and that is that the majority of this House, incited thereto by hon. Gentlemen below the gangway, have come to the conclusion that, whatever be Sir Horace Plunkett's qualifications for this post, however devoted he may be to the task he has undertaken, however great may be the work he is doing, he has committed one crime which is unpardonable—he has retained his Unionist opinions. I think that a very unhappy conclusion for the Government to arrive at. If when they came into office they had said to Sir Horace Plunkett, "You have always taken your position as that of a Party politician, you always expected to leave office with the Government with whom you on the whole agreed, we regret your departure, as, on a change of Government, the country has often to regret the departure of very eminent politicians," then their position would have been absolutely unassailable, and the last person to assail it would have been Sir Horace Plunkett. But to ask him to go on not to give evidence——

Mr. BIRRELL: The last part of the letter says the Government retain their freedom of future action.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Whatever it means, it does not mean giving evidence before the Committee. I do not accuse the right hon. Gentleman of breach of faith; I do not say the Government have broken any pledge they gave to Sir Horace Plunkett or anybody else. My charge, if you call it a charge, is of a different kind. I say they asked this eminent official to go on with his work, irrespective of the Committee, because he was specially qualified to do it, and now, because hon. Gentlemen below the gangway accuse him of no crime but the crime of Unionism, they turn round and say that, as soon as the Committee report, whatever they report, Sir Horace Plunkett is to be relieved of an office in which he continued at their special request. It is an unhappy decision, and, if the Government will allow me to say so, it is a decision of especially unhappy augury in view of those schemes of devolution of which we know but little, but of which one result we know will be that Unionists will meet with an absolute bar in the future, whatever their services may have been.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): A direct charge has been made, not only against Mr. Bryce, but also against myself, who am more responsible, in one sense, than Mr. Bryce, of having treated Sir Horace Plunkett in a certain way because he was a Unionist. Such an idea never entered into our heads. My right. hon. friend has explained the circumstances exactly. We were going to have a general supervision and investigation of this Department. We thought it most undesirable, seeing we could not tell what the result of that inquiry would be, that a fresh appointment should be made, subject to all possible changes that might take place, and we asked Sir Horace Plunkett, as a favour to the Government as well as to the country, to continue during the interval to discharge his duties; but we explained to him, and explained in this House, in the clearest possible manner, that it was only a temporary continuation of the appointment.

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House divided:—Ayes, 247; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 142.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ambrose, Robert
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Som'rs't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beck, A. Cecil
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn. Sir J. T. (Ches.
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Gr'st'd
Crean, Eugene
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W, H, (St. Pancras, N.
Dillon, John
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Edwards, Enoch (Hanley)
Elibank, Master of
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.

Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey,W.E. (Derbyshire,N.E.
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M. (Aberdeen, W.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King,Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington)
Lever,A.Levy (Essex,Harwich)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Chas. (Donegal, E.)
M‘Callum, John M.
M‘Crae, George
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
M‘Kean, John
M‘Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M‘Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M‘Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon Launceston)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murnaghan, George
Murphy, John
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron, Walden)
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W.Monm'h
Richards,T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann,SirC.E. (Manchester)
Scott,A.H. (Ashton under Lyne
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Spicer, Sir Albert
Strachey, Sir Edward
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas,DavidAlfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Watt, Henry A.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Captain Donelan.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,RtHn.SirAlex.F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Armitage, R.
Arnold-Forster,Rt.Hn.HughO.
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour,RtHnA.J. (City Lond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beach,Hn. Michael HughHicks
Beauchamp, E.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brooke, Stopford

Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clark, George Smith (Belfast, N.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birminghm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cory, Clifford John
Courthope, G. Loyd
Cox, Harold
Craig, Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lamont, Norman
Fane-Fox, G. R.
Liddell, Henry
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, W. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Percy, Earl
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, Jn. Frederick Peel
Renton, Major Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. Hugh Barrie.

Main Question again proposed.

And, it being after Eleven of the clock, Mr. Speaker proceeded to interrupt the Business.

Whereupon Mr. John Redmond rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Main Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Resolved, "That the position of Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture in Ireland was intended by Parliament to be, and in fact is, a Ministerial and Parliamentary office, properly vacated upon a change of Government, and that the retention of that office by a political opponent of the Government of the day is undesirable as a permanent arrangement."—(*Mr. Murphy.*)

IRISH TOBACCO BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; to be read the third time to-morrow.

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES [EXPENSES].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment out of money voted by Parliament for Army services of necessary expenditure incurred by associations in pursuance of any Act of the present session to provide for the re-organisation of His Majesty's military forces, and for that purpose to authorise the establishment of county associations and the raising and maintenance of a Territorial Force and to amend the Acts relating to the Reserve Forces (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Eleven o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 25th April, 1907.

Lucas Peerage.—Report from the Committee for Privileges made, and agreed to.

Wentworth Canning Blackett, Baron Allendale.—Was (in the usual manner) introduced by virtue of a Patent, dated the 20th day of July, 1906, his father the first Baron, who was created by such Patent, never having taken his seat.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Southend Water Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Electric Supply Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Read 2^{a}, and committed.

Midland Railway Bill [H.L.]; York (Micklegate Strays) Bill [H.L.]; Sheffield Corporation Bill [H.L.]; City of London (Union of Parishes) Bill [H.L.]; Cavehill and Whitewell Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Aberdeen Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee for the consideration of the said Bills; viz.:—

L. Howard De Walden,
L. Sinclair,
L. Clements (*E. Leitrim*),
L. Seaton,
L. Ludlow (Chairman);

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly: The Committee to meet on Thursday next, at eleven o'clock; and all petitions referred to the Committee, with leave to the petitioners praying to be heard by counsel against the Bills to be heard as desired, as also counsel for the Bills.

Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [H.L.]; Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.]; Colne Valley Water Bill [H.L.]; Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Earl of Devon be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Biddulph; read and agreed to.

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges etc.) Bill; Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the following Lords be proposed to the House to form the Select Committee to join with the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the said Bills; viz.:—

M. Winchester,
E. Manvers,
V. Cross,
L. Aberdare,
L. Leith of Fyvie;

agreed to; and the said Lords appointed accordingly: Ordered that such Committee have power to agree with the Committee of the House of Commons in the appointment of a Chairman. Then a message was ordered to be sent to the House of Commons in answer to their message of the 26th of March last, to inform them of the appointment of the said Committee by this House, and to propose that the Joint Committee do meet in Committee Room A. on Thursday next at three o'clock.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.—Read 2^{a} (according to order), and committed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EGYPT No. 3. (1907).

Despatch from the Earl of Cromer respecting proposals of the Egyptian General Assembly.

AFRICA No. 1. (1907).

Correspondence respecting the Independent State of the Congo.

TRADE REPORTS.

Annual Series: No. 3768. Italy (Rome.)

Miscellaneous Series: No. 659. (Danish system of Taxation.)

IRELAND DEVELOPMENT GRANT ACT, 1903.

Report of the Lord-Lieutenant of all his proceedings under the Act, for the financial year ended 31st March, 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POLICE (COUNTIES AND BOROUGHS, ENGLAND AND WALES).

Reports of His Majesty's inspectors of constabulary, for the year ended 29th September 1906: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PHOSPHORUS POISONING.

*THE EARL OF LYTTON rose to call attention to the death from necrosis recently reported at Messrs. Morelands, and to ask His Majesty's Government whether, in view of the fact that phosphorus poisoning cannot be prevented by the special regulations at present in force, they will reconsider their attitude towards the Convention of Berne prohibiting the use of yellow phosphorus.

The noble Earl said: My Lords, I realise that your Lordships are all waiting to listen to the discussion which will take place on the Motion of the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, and I shall only stand for a few minutes between him and the House. Shortly before the Easter adjournment a number of Questions were addressed to the Home Secretary in the House of Commons concerning the death from necrosis which occurred at Messrs. Moreland's match factory in January of this year. In addition to the Answers of the Home Secretary to those Questions a very full and interesting report has been published, written by Mr. Cunynghame and Mr. Whitelegge, which gives full information on the subject of this particular case. Therefore it is not with the object of obtaining more information about this case that I raise the question again, but rather with the object of drawing attention to the wider issues which it involves, and of trying to elicit from His Majesty's Government some statement as to their general attitude towards this particular dangerous process. And from this point of view the question has an interest outside any one factory, and even outside the limits of this country as a whole, because it deals with a matter which has now become one of international concern. During recent years a number of conferences have been held from time to time in some central Continental town by the representatives of the leading European States for the purpose of discussing industrial questions and in the hope of arriving at some common action for the improvement of the conditions of labour generally. At these conferences the regulation of certain well-known dangerous trades has been much discussed, and with regard to the use of white or yellow phosphorus, considerable progress has been made towards some common agreement between the various States.

I ought, perhaps, to explain that white or yellow phosphorus, which is a very dangerous and poisonous article, is only used in the manufacture of what are known as "strike anywhere" matches. It is not used in the manufacture of matches which strike on the box. Nor is it absolutely essential in the manufacture of the other kind of matches. In fact, other harmless alternative processes have been invented and are in actual use at the present day; and as an instance that it is possible to do without this process I need only mention that in one of the leading and best known match manufactories in this country, that of Messrs. Bryant and May, means have been found of making every class of match which the public require without using any white phosphorus at all. That it is not only possible in the case of a particular firm, but that it is possible for the whole country to do without this commodity is proved by the action of six European States, who signed a Convention in September of last year by which they prohibited its use in their territories. That Convention was signed by France, Germany, Italy, Holland, Denmark and Switzerland. Each of these six States has signed a treaty whereby they prohibit in their territories the manufacture, use, or importation of matches made with phosphorus, and it is the attitude of this country towards that Convention to which I wish to call the attention of your Lordships this afternoon.

Great Britain has declared its willingness to join with the other countries and sign this treaty only on condition that every other country which exports these matches does the same, and when that qualified promise was given it was perfectly well known that the qualification could not be carried out by reason of the fact that amongst the nations whose adherence would be required was the United States of America, and that the United States Constitution prevents the Federal Government from entering into an arrangement of this kind which is binding on the different States. Therefore the promise which the Government made does not amount to very much. Reasons have been put forward by the Home Office for their refusal to enter into this treaty, and the reasons are that as an alternative to prohibition we have in force in this country a very strict code of regulations, which it is held diminishes to a large extent the possibility of phosphorus poisoning. These regulations are excellent so far as they go, but the fact remains—and the fact has been proved again by this death which has recently taken place—that these regulations are not sufficient to prevent phosphorus poisoning altogether.

Five cases of phosphorus poisoning have occurred since these regulations came into force, and in Mr. Cunynghame's report we are led to believe that more cases will very likely occur in the future. I have no wish to exaggerate the facts of the case. Five deaths may not be very many in five years. It is not the object of my argument to prove that deaths from phosphorus poisoning are frequent. At the same time it will be admitted, I imagine, that every human life is worth saving if it be possible, and here is an opportunity which, if the Government chose to make use of it, would enable them to stamp out this disease altogether in this country. That there are difficulties in the way is obvious. Changes of this sort are not made without some sacrifices and some expenses. The difficulties have been pointed out in a Memorandum issued by the Under-Secretary of the Home Office, who was our representative at the Conference of Berne. But, if there are some obstacles in the way, all the greater credit belongs to those countries which play the part of pioneers and successfully overcome them.

It has been pointed out in this Home Office Memorandum that greater work would probably devolve upon the Customs officials, who would be required to carry out any measure of prohibition, but I think we may set against any additional work to that Government Department a diminution of labour to the Home Office, who have at present to see that these very strict regulations are carried out. Then it has been suggested that there might be, as a result of any measure of prohibition, some increase in the price of matches. Cheapness in all things is desirable as a general rule, but I imagine that your Lordships will agree that even cheap matches may be bought too dearly if they are bought at the price of human lives.

Other objections have been stated in the Memorandum, some of which I cannot help thinking are a little far fetched. For instance, the Under-Secretary states that if Parliament were to carry a measure prohibiting the use of these articles, it would necessitate the postponement of other useful measures of social reform which the Government have in contemplation. We all know well that the programme of the Government is a very full one, and we may assume that the measures which they are going to pass will be of a beneficial character. One of such measures we shall be discussing in a very few minutes. But, my Lords, when they have succeeded in satisfying the religious scruples of one section of their followers and the land hunger of another section, when they have reorganised the Army and brought good government and peace to Ireland, is it extravagant to hope that a measure for the protection of human life may find a place among their minor efforts?

In all seriousness, my Lords, if the difficulties in the way of carrying a measure of this sort and if the objections to it were many times greater than they are made out to be in this Memorandum, they are still objections which other countries have had to meet; and what the Government have to show is not that difficulties exist, but wherein our difficulties are greater than those of other countries, and why we are not in a position to do what other countries have done. When once the stage of international co-operation has been reached it is impossible for one country to stand absolutely by itself and look upon any question from its own point of view alone. This is just one of those questions where the moral responsibility is out of all proportion to any consideration of mere economic or administrative concern.

I submit to your Lordships that it is a little selfish, a little un-chivalrous, for us in Great Britain to say that because we do not largely use this commodity in our country, because we have a very admirable system of regulations in force, we are not going to help other nations in the efforts which they are making to get this dangerous disease stamped out; and it is not very heroic for a country which is proud of its industrial position and for a Government which claims to have the interests of the working classes more especially at heart, to return this answer to the other nations, "What you propose is very good; we have no objection to make to it; it is admirable in principle and we will leave you to settle the matter among yourselves, and when you have all agreed on common action we will come in and join you. We will be the very last country to put our signature to the agreement." If this country is to take part in these Conferences at all it would surely be better for the Government to send its representatives to them in rather a different spirit from that which has animated them in the past. I wish I could hope that they might take some pride in being in the van rather than in the rear of any movement, and that they would seek for this country the position of a leader of European thought rather than that of a tardy follower, and that we might become willing initiators rather than reluctant imitators of other countries. Surely such a role as that which I have suggested would be more in keeping with the dignity of this country, more worthy of its traditions and its industrial position, and more helpful to the cause of industrial progress. It is with the object of eliciting from His Majesty's Government some statement of the reasons why, when this opportunity has been afforded to them of co-operation with other countries, they have withheld their support that I have raised this question, and I would most respectfully ask His Majesty's Government whether they will not reconsider the reasons which have led them to refuse up to the present moment to sign the Convention of Berne.

*EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, the answer I have to give to the noble Earl is one which he probably anticipates. It is that His Majesty's Government adhere generally to the Memorandum to which reference has already been made by the noble Earl. The position is really a perfectly simple one. When in 1900 there was a great deal of public discussion on this question the Secretary of State might then have prohibited the use of phosphorus in this country, but as an alternative special rules were made, and we are now able, after the lapse of these years, to see what has been the result of those rules. The noble Earl will see in a Report to which he did not, I think, refer—the Memorandum on the International Conference on Labour Regulations at Berne—statistics with regard to the number of cases of necrosis which have occurred since the special rules came into force, and I think they go far to show that the rules which were made by the Secretary of State at the time have had a very satisfactory result.

There have been only five cases of necrosis in the first five years, of which three were mild, and in three cases the persons recovered and found other employment. The other two cases were fatal, but these occurred in the year 1905. There were no cases in 1906, and there has only been this single case since. Necrosis, experts say, is not a disease which, once caught, immediately appears. It has a long period during which it lurks in the system, and it only makes its appearance subsequently. The man who died this year worked for twelve years prior to 1900 in a match factory in Ireland. That was before the new rules were made. Then in 1900 he came to the factory in question in Gloucester, and in 1902, owing to a trivial accident amputation became necessary. I would point to the probable, if not the practical, certainty that the disease was contracted before the new regulations came into practice, and therefore it would not be fair to ascribe this case as being in any way due to the failure of the present regulations.

His Majesty's Government are, therefore, of opinion that the alternative which the Home Secretary took in 1900 of making special rules has been successful, and, in these circumstances, they propose to adhere to the position. I might, perhaps, say that in this matter they are following the example of Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, and Austria-Hungary, which were represented at the Berne Conference as well as of Norway and Japan, which were not so represented. The Home Secretary has in contemplation other amendments, specially designed to meet such a case as the one which has just occurred, with regard to dental examination. He will see that special arrangements are made for inquiry and report from experts in the matter of dental examination; and it is also the intention of the Secretary of State to make a rule to prevent tobacco chewing, which has an especially bad effect upon those who work in these factories. In these circumstances, I cannot help thinking that the action of His Majesty's Government in adhering to the course which has been taken is quite justified.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND SMALL HOLDINGS.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE rose to call attention to the speech delivered on the 20th of April by the Prime Minister at the Holborn Restaurant, in reference to the question of small holdings, and particularly to the following passage—

> "I notice further that from one district after another, as official Returns show, the demand for land for the purposes of use and labour is met by blank denial."

And—

> "There is a whole mass of official testimony to show that a strong demand for this type of holding exists in many parts of the country, and if only this demand could be satisfied, the young men and the best men in the villages. instead of setting their faces in despair towards the town, would be glad to remain at home. We hear of this unsatisfied land hunger very largely in the East of England, we hear of it in the Midlands, we hear of it in the Southern Counties."

And to ask whether the "official Returns" and the "mass of official testimony" mentioned by the Prime Minister have already been laid before Parliament; and to move for Papers.

The noble Marquess said: My Lords, I should like to explain, if I may, at the outset, that when I put this notice on the Paper I did not do so with any idea of provoking this evening a general discussion upon the question of small holdings or rural depopulation. Your Lordships would have been entitled to much longer notice if there had been any question of such a discussion. But it did seem to me that as this question is apparently to be given very great prominence in the near future, as we are told that it is to be the subject of what is described as a "crusade," it would be for the public advantage that we should endeavour as far as possible to obtain all the available information in regard to the basis of solid fact on which legislation of this kind will no doubt proceed. We ought to know, I think, all that can be ascertained with regard to the extent of the demand for small holdings, with regard to the extent to which that demand has been frustrated, and with regard to the causes which have led to any disappointment which has been experienced. I hope this evening we may obtain, at any rate, some contribution towards the knowledge which we desire.

I trust, however, that your Lordships will not think me presumptuous if, before I go further, I say one word with regard to what I conceive to be attitude of the land-owning class, which is so numerously represented in this House, towards this great question. I am under the impression that there is a widespread, if not general, agreement among that class to the effect that the policy of consolidating holdings which prevailed for so many years was a mistaken policy, and that we are glad to know, on the authority of a Parliamentary Committee, that for some years past that policy has ceased to prevail, and that people are content with holdings of a reasonable dimension. Most of us, I think, would be inclined to go further, and to say that the ideal system would be one, not of large holdings or small holdings, but a system in which holdings would be graduated in size, so as to give an ample opportunity to deserving men to rise from the ranks and gradually acquire a larger and larger stake in the agricultural enterprise of the country.

If we come to the political aspect of the question, I think we should all of us say that the agricultural system of this country would be founded on a much sounder basis if means could be discovered for largely increasing the number of persons interested in the soil. I, therefore, venture to predict that most of us as politicians and public men will be found desirous of removing every impediment in the way of the adoption of such a policy as I have described, and that as individuals and landowners we shall be ready to give all reasonable facilities for the adoption of such a policy. I should like to look forward to a movement in favour of a policy of that kind, tending surely, if slowly, to bring back more and more people to the soil; and having the support of the three great classes in the agricultural community and of the two great political Parties in the State.

It is because an ideal of that kind is present to my mind that I read with much regret the speech delivered by the Prime Minister on Saturday last, to which I am about to call attention. That speech appeared to me to be needlessly provocative in tone. It seemed to me to suggest very erroneous ideas—ideas calculated not to advance, but to retard the kind of settlement which we all desire. It was a speech remarkable, not only for what it contained, but for what it omitted. It was an essay upon rural depopulation, but it altogether failed to explain that rural depopulation has been due, not to one cause, but to the combination of a great many cases. It is true that early in the speech there was one short sentence in which the speaker admitted that the advent of free trade and the extension of facilities for the rapid transportation of goods had very profoundly affected the agriculture of these islands. But there was no attempt to describe the extent to which foreign competition, higher taxation, and such other like causes had depressed the position of cultivators of the soil in these islands.

Again, I find nothing in the speech calculated to bring home to the audience the enormous difficulty and expense attending any attempt to adapt the farms of this country to an entirely new kind of distribution amongst cultivators. I find no reference to the extreme difficulty of selecting men competent to undertake this detailed cultivation of the land. Nor, again, was there any indication that the speaker was aware that it is only in certain parts of the country, and where there are certain conditions of soil and climate, that *petite culture* can be resorted to with advantage. Nothing, again, was said of the risk of failure where the experiment was tried under unpropitious conditions, or of the costly results of such failure—and costly it must be either to the cultivators themselves, or to the taxpayers, or to the ratepayers, or to whoever it is who finds the sinews of war for the attempt.

Nor, again, did the Prime Minister touch upon what has always seemed to me one of the most interesting and suggestive features of the case—I mean the effect upon the young people of this country of the kind of education which they obtain in our village schools, an education which, I believe, does very little indeed to fit them for the profession of agriculture. All those points were slurred over, and prominence was given to one cause and to one cause alone—I mean the alleged reluctance of the landowning class to give facilities for the experiments. My Lords, that was, if I may use the expression, the *leit motif* which ran through the whole performance—the selfish refusal of the owners of the soil—because that was again and again accentuated—the selfish refusal of the owners of the soil to give facilities for any new departure in this direction.

If that was not the purport of the speech, then, I say, what was the meaning of that remarkable passage in which the speaker dwelt upon the dislike of the squire to see such common things as cabbages and pigs and unseemly outhouses? That was the description—that the squire and his friends "in society" found something displeasing in the appearance of those familiar objects, and that it was because those familiar obects were displeasing that this denial took place. Or what, again, was the meaning of the passage containing the reference to the increase in the number of gamekeepers, and to the time wasted in discussions as to the hares and pheasants of the landlords? What are we to think when we find passages of that kind placed in close juxtaposition with references to derelict farms and deserted villages? Is not the suggestion that the farms are derelict and the villages deserted because those selfish considerations have prevailed with the landowners of the country? Then, last of all, there comes this remarkable assertion, that the peasantry of England migrate to the towns because, while they remain in their villages, they cannot call their souls their own. I should should like to hear that statement repeated to an audience of sturdy villagers in the part of England which I know best.

I complain of all this becaues it seems to me quite needlessly to import prejudice into the consideration of a great public matter. These statements may be useful for political leaflets, to be scattered before an ignorant audience at the time of a general election; they may serve their purpose for those who wish to make an attack upon your Lordships' House; but, with all respect, I say they are unworthy of the great position held by the man who made use of them, and they are not calculated to bring about that co-operation towards a common object which I, for one, desire to see so much.

These statements are, of course, general statements, and, therefore, not very easy to deal with. I cannot come here and prove to your Lordships—although I can go very near it—that the squire in many parts of England is never better pleased than when he sees a great number of the humble animals, to which the Prime Minister referred, in the farmyards of his tenants. But there did come a point when the Prime Minister was precise. It is to that part of his speech that I desire particularly to call attention. The Prime Minister told his audience that there was a great mass of official testimony to show that a strong demand for this type of holding exists in many parts of the country, and that, if only this demand could be satisfied, the young men and the best men in the villages, instead of setting their faces in despair towards the towns, would be glad to remain at home; and he also said that he noticed that from one district after another, as official returns showed, the demand for land for the purposes of use and labour is met—I call your Lordship's attention to the expression—by a blank denial.

Now, I am anxious, and I think many of your Lordships must be anxious to see, these official returns. I want to know where and to what extent these requests for land have been met by a blank denial on the part of those who were in a position to meet them. Let me say that, if this mass of official testimony is not produced and laid upon this Table, we shall take leave to disbelieve altogether in its existence. I understand that my noble friend the President of the Board of Agriculture will follow me, and I am quite sure he will give me a courteous and considerate answer, but I should like to warn him that there are one or two kinds of answer which he might possibly give which would not satisfy me. I shall not be satisfied if the noble Earl tells me that one or two, perhaps anonymous, landlords have behaved unreasonably in the matter of small holdings. It is quite possible; although, if there are such cases, I should like to hear the other side and to give the person accused an opportunity of giving an account of his conduct. But I shall not be content with the production of what, I think, the Prime Minister called, upon another occasion, samples of this kind of misconduct, I shall be very suspicious of samples; I do not think they are always quite fairly chosen out of the heap. And I want to know a little more about the size of the heap and the contents of it.

Then, again, I shall not be content if the noble Earl tells me that difficulties have been encountered on some occasions with farmers. The farmers are men of business, and they naturally are not always very favourable to the idea of seeing their holdings parcelled out and distributed to other people; and it is quite likely that the farmers in some cases have been found tenacious of that which is their own. Then, again, it will not content me to be told that the local bodies, the county councils, for example, have been rather slow in moving. The county councils have got to think of the ratepayers and the ratepayers' money, and, if they are prudent, they will not be in too great a hurry to plunge into these experiments at the cost of the ratepayers. These answers I shall not be content with, because the charge of the Prime Minister —and I defy anyone to contradict me— is levelled, not at individual landlords, not at farmers nor at the local authorities, but at the landowners as a class.

I shall be very much surprised if, after all, this great mass of official testimony proves to be quite so convincing as we are led to expect, and I will tell your Lordships why. I have paid some attention to the Returns which have been laid upon this subject, and I find in those, no doubt, indications of the difficulty of carrying out at a great pace far-reaching experiments of this kind, but I do not find in them anything suggestive of the kind of organized refusal amongst the landlords which has been suggested in the Prime Minister's speech. But there is another document —a document of very great value—which has lately been placed in our hands, I mean the Report of the Committee appointed by my noble friend Lord Onslow when he was President of the Board of Agriculture. I commend that Report to the attention of those of your Lordships who have not already read it. Let me say that I do not agree with the whole of the recommendations of that Committee. But the value of the Report lies in this: that it is the testimony of men who knew their subject thoroughly, and who had done their best to collect evidence as to matters of fact from all parts of the country and from many different classes of people. This Report is entirely sympathetic to the policy of small holdings, but it is fair and judicial in tone, and well worth careful reading.

In that Report I do not find any reference to a universal demand for small holdings. What I do find in it is that there is a local demand, a sporadic demand, varying very much according to the circumstances and conditions of the neighbourhood. I find in it that there are many conditions—conditions which are not to be found everywhere— in the absence of which the experiment is predestined to failure. I find that, even where the circumstances are favourable, the operation must necessarily be a very costly one, and I find it stated that one of the greatest difficulties attending that experiment—perhaps the greatest of all—lies in the selection of suitable individuals, and for this reason— I am quoting the words of the Report— that

> "Men who have failed in every other walk of life think that any man can make money out of the land."

Now, I believe that is a very widespread fallacy; it is one against which we have to guard ourselves very carefully. I await the production of this official evidence, and I shall be very much surprised if it does not confirm my view.

But perhaps before I leave the subject I may be allowed to say one word upon another branch of it. I think we have a right to demand these official papers, but I am going to ask the noble Earl, rather by way of a favour, whether he will not add to that something which a great many of us would like to have—that is, an authoritative and complete statement of the experiments which he has himself carried out in order to introduce a system of small holdings. The *role* of the noble Earl is a somewhat remarkable one in these controversies. In the old-fashioned missionary meetings, it was usual, I believe, to produce a black man, who was exhibited as a member of a dangerous tribe, a tribe addicted to strange meats and evil practices of all sorts, and he was exhibited as a specimen of the successful results of the missionary's work, clad in broadcloth and satisfied with beef steaks.

My noble friend is invariably exhibited as a specimen—perhaps the single specimen—of a regenerated landlord. He is described, as the Prime Minister described him the other evening, as being fortunate in that he owns estates which are "perfect hives of industry and prosperity." I am almost tempted to say that there is one phenomenon which we usually connect with hives, and which has been apparent in connection with the estates of the noble Lord—there has been a good deal of buzzing about them. I can assure my noble friend that I say these things in no cynical spirit, because I really believe that our admiration is due to him for having exerted himself, as probably very few people have, to solve this problem. He is an enthusiast. I am one of those who admire enthusiasts. I do not think we have nearly enough of them, and I lay my tribute of admiration at the feet of the noble Earl.

But I want him to tell us how it is done. We are told he is the one person who has solved the problem. Now, what is the problem? It is that of equipping what is described as an uneconomic holding without any loss to the public purse. That is a pretty considerable problem, and, if the noble Earl can tell us how he has solved it, we shall one and all feel that we owe him a debt of gratitude. There is something to be found about the noble Earl's experiments in the Report of Lord Onslow's Committee, and I draw some rather interesting conclusions from it. If your Lordships will look at page 20 you will find that the noble Earl's experiences were of a rather varied character. In the case of one or, I think, two estates he was able to divest himself entirely of his acres by selling them to the Holland County Council in Lincolnshire and the South Lincolnshire Small Holdings Association, and the Report goes on to say—

> "This association occupies the position of a substantial tenant and eliminates those risks which often make landlords unwilling to let land to labouring men and others."

The noble Earl was in clover there, because the risk was eliminated. Then there was another estate in which the experiment seems to have succeeded. It was in the neighbourhood of Spalding, and it took place upon land exceptionally well adapted for growing early vegetables peas, potatoes, etc., and, to a small extent, spring flowers and bulbs. We cannot all run to spring flowers and bulbs. We should be delighted if we could, but I fear it is impossible. There was yet another estate in the neighbourhood of Flackwell Heath. There the rent has not been punctually paid, though the tenants manage to make a living. That is not putting it very high. And in yet another portion of the noble Earl's possessions where he endeavoured to establish small holdings it is reported that the experiment failed, and that the seven small holdings created have been absorbed by one man. I assume that there were cases in which the experiment succeeded entirely, but it is quite clear from the quotations I have given to the House that the noble Earl is not able, by merely raising his finger, to solve the difficulties which so many people have been wholly unable to surmount.

I must add yet one other thing. The noble Earl is in a particularly favourable position to give the House information, because last year, under a little Act of Parliament which, I daresay, passed through this House without very much notice, he became an *ex officio* Commissioner of Woods and Forests. He is the *adlatus* of the Commissioners appointed under the Act of 1851, and he is, I presume, at this moment harnessed between the two steady-going officials who now preside over the affairs of that office. That gives the noble Earl 71,000 acres——

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Earl CARRINGTON): Sixty-two thousand.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I beg pardon, 62,000 acres upon which to try experiments, and we are informed by the Prime Minister that he has begun to try them already. That will be most interesting, and I hope the noble Earl will tell us how he is getting on with the Crown estates. We shall have to keep a weather-eye upon him, because, if he does not administer the Crown estates with proper prudence and diligence the taxpayers of the country will have something to say about it.

I apologise to the House for having spoken so long, and I would end with only one observation of a quite general character. It is this. In my view we should never lose sight of the fact that agriculture is a business, and that it must be carried on on businesslike lines. If in agriculture, or in any other business, you are going to strike out upon an entirely new venture, you ought to have a clear idea of where you are going, why you are going there, and how you mean to get there; and I do trust that His Majesty's Government will not lose sight of that consideration. But I rejoice that they are able to approach the problem in a hopeful, or even in a sanguine, spirit; do not. however, let them suppose that by a wave of a magician's wand, by any legislation, however courageous, they will be able suddenly to bring back to the villages people who have left the villages for the towns, or that they will be able, at any rate not without something like a revolution and without creating great hardship and injustice, suddenly to cut up farms tenanted by hard-working and industrious men into Scottish crofts or English market gardens. I do, on the other hand, believe that something can be done, and most of us will be very glad indeed if we can help to do it. But let me say this—it is my last word. If you wish us to help, there is a right and a wrong way of setting to work, and the speech to which I have ventured to call attention this evening appears to me to be an example of the wrong way of setting to work.

EARL CARRINGTON: My Lords, the noble Marquess has put his Question down on the Paper, and the first word he used in his most interesting, and, as far as I was concerned, and I have to thank him for it, most kindly and complimentary speech was a request for information as to solid fact. I should like to put myself in the hands of the House as regards the solid fact, because I do not know whether noble Lords have seen the Parliamentary Papers which were published this morning and which contain the Answer of the Prime Minister to the Question on this subject he was asked in the House of Commons on the 24th.† The official Returns to which Mr. Lane-Fox referred are set out in that Answer. They extend over three pages, and I am afraid I should weary the patience of the House if I read through all those official documents, which are Reports which have been laid on the Table of the House of Commons at various times, and all of them, I think, with one exception, during the time that the Unionist and Conservative Government was in power.

But before proceeding to deal with them, I should like to call attention to two or three remarks which preceded the noble Marquess's Question. He alluded to the attitude of the landowning class; and I am sure all my friends on this side of the House will have been delighted to hear him say that they considered the consolidation policy of past years a mistake. He then adumbrated an ideal system of graduating the size of farms. That, I am happy to inform the noble Marquess, is our object, that is our ideal. It is our ambition to manage, if possible, something of the sort, that there should be farms of all sizes and all descriptions so that a man should be able to own a small farm and eventually go on to a bigger farm; and I was very glad to hear from the noble Marquess that all facilities will be given on that side of the House towards the adoption of that policy.

I was a little bit disappointed with the way in which the noble Marquess alluded to the speech of the Prime Minister on Saturday. I heard that speech, and I am bound to say that I cannot see the amount of provocation which the noble Marquess thought fit to attribute to it. It is very easy to take sentences here and there away from their context and then to fling them at the unfortunate speaker's head and say, "This is provocative," and "This ought not to have been said." I cannot admit that, if you read the speech carefully, there is that amount of provocation in it which the noble Marquess tries to prove. Then the noble Marquess complained of the omissions from the speech. But the speech lasted fifty-five minutes. It was a very long speech, and if all the reasons for rural depopulation had been introduced by my right hon. friend we should have been there now. I might *en passant* say that there was one particular reason which we are always told is the one great reason for the depopulation of our rural districts which the noble Marquess, inadvertently, I am sure, omitted to mention. That was the cause of free trade, and if we had had a discussion on the cause of free trade I do not know when the speech of my right hon. friend would have ended. But my right hon. friend stuck to one point, and he was perfectly right in doing so, one point on which we are all agreed, that there is great difficulty in getting land for small holdings throughout England.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 10.

The noble Marquess said that he was very suspicious of what he calls samples. So am I, and I thank him for the wording of his question; for there he confines himself entirely to official Returns, and therefore I hope I may be excused for not mentioning any landowner's name or holding up any person to be gibbeted, as that only makes bad blood and defeats the object which we have in view. I hope I shall not be accused of shirking this question if I do not do that. But the noble Marquess acknowledged that the county councils had been very slow. I think they have been uncommonly slow, for we have been waiting and waiting for the last fifteen years for them to do something. Speaking from memory, I think that out of the 32,000,000 acres of agricultural land in England the county councils have produced the magnificent total of 800 odd acres of small holdings, and of these eighty acres are in the county of London. So that the county councils cannot say that they have helped to solve this problem.

The noble Marquess asked me to give him a complete statement of the result of my own experiments. I shall be very glad to send him some literature on the subject. I have two or three pamphlets which I will forward to the noble Marquess, and I hope he will do me the honour of reading them. I must say that in my own experience I have found allotments and small holdings to answer everywhere except in one district, where some persons who never ought to have had allotments were given land, and tried what they could do with it. The land was unsuitable, and so these seven sportsmen gave it up as a bad job. But I hope the House will believe me when I say that I am the last person in the world to put myself on a pedestal in this matter. I have tried in my humble way to do what I could. But I deprecate being put forward as an example in any sort of way.

When you think of what Lord Harrowby has done—he has, I think, 2,000 acres under small holdings—and when you think of what landowners like the late Lord Tollemache have done, and what my friend Mr. Jesse Collings has done in promoting small holdings, it must be admitted that the experience of these practical men, who approach the subject in a businesslike way, sustains my contention that small holdings can be made to pay, and that they are an immense boon in almost every part of England.

In the Parliamentary Papers issued this morning the House will see a great mass of official evidence, which proves up to the hilt every word that my right hon. friend said on Saturday. I will refer only to one document—a letter addressed to me on April 15th by the parish council of Moulton, near Spalding. They are a very shrewd, hard-working people there, and the allotments in that part of the country have been a very great success. Such a success have they been that, while in the ten years between 1882 and 1892 the exodus from the nineteen villages round Spalding was 2,500, in the ten years from 1892 to 1902 the exodus fell to 150. During the latter period the Lincolnshire Small Holdings Association was in operation, and these figures show how allotments keep the people on the land. The letter to which I refer from the Moulton Parish Council begins as follows—

"To the Right Hon. Earl Carrington,

"President of the Board of Agriculture.

"We, the undersigned, members of the Moulton Parish Council, assembled at the annual meeting, respectfully desire to draw your Lordship's attention to the pressing demand for small holdings in this and surrounding parishes in South Lincolnshire.

"In the past, vacant farms have usually been let to progressive farmers; and small holders and would-be small holders have been passed by. As things are at present it is almost impossible for an industrious and capable man to hire a small holding except at an exorbitant rent. Even at such rent the holdings available are very few.

"This large parish contains about 12,000 acres of fertile land, nearly all of which is suitable for cultivation by small holders.

"Nearly 3,000 acres are held by three tenants out of a population of 2,017, living in 463 houses; twenty tenants occupy nearly half the land in the parish, upwards of 5,000 acres.

"We believe that this distribution of the land is typical of the parishes in South Lincolnshire."

The writers go on to say—

"The rents paid by existing small holders run to £5 per acre including the house and buildings. There are five small holdings in the parish, cultivated as ordinary agricultural land, rented at £4 and upwards per acre.

"The average rent of all existing small holdings is about 33 per cent. more than the average rent of the larger farms. The larger farms are well equipped as a rule with house, cottages, and buildings; the small holdings are often badly equipped with buildings. Several persons pay a separate rent for a house and buildings, and then hire odd fields at rentals of 50s. and 60s. per acre.

"The parish council hires allotment land from five landowners which it has to let at rents varying from £2 to £3 per acre, inclusive of rates. This land has no buildings of any kind upon it.

"There are 151 allotment holders in the parish. Under existing circumstances they can make no progress. Several of these desire to become small holders. There is also a strong demand for land from persons who would not require houses. But the experience of members of this council is that holdings of from 25 acres upwards with cottages and buildings on them are chiefly required.

"There are capable men with money saved and friends willing to assist, ready to take and work such holdings; hundreds more in the future would come forward for such holdings if only they could see a prospect of obtaining them.

"The parish council desire, if they may do so, to add that where the land is suitable, the question of buildings need be no obstacle. The small holder can live and afford to pay the same rent as paid by the larger farmer and, in addition, a fair interest upon any reasonable sum necessary to furnish the land with houses and buildings."

That letter was signed by the whole eleven members of the parish council, and it states that two young men left the parish for Canada this week, and that six of the brothers of the Chairman have emigrated to Canada.

LORD ASHBOURNE: Is it stated that the owners made any objection?

EARL CARRINGTON: Yes, that is why the parish council have written to me.

LORD ASHBOURNE: I understood it was the farmers, not the owners.

EARL CARRINGTON: The farmers do not own the land. I will read the passage again—

"In the past, vacant farms have usually been let to progressive farmers; and small holders and would-be small holders have been passed by."

I should like to add a personal statement relating to my own experience. It concerns a farm of 800 acres, belonging to the Crown, in Wingland, in Lincolnshire. In 1905 the tenant of this farm died, and the Lincolnshire Small Holders' Association, of which I am a member, applied to take the farm for small holdings from the Commissioners of Woods and Forests. We were refused at once, and had not even the opportunity of making an offer. That farm was let to a young man twenty-four years of age, whose father farmed the adjoining 400 acres, and thus the two farms were consolidated. That surely is a case of "an official blank denial," in the clearest sense of the term. I do not think a better case could be given of what the Prime Minister had in his mind.

I do not wish in any way to bring an accusation or complaint against the Commissioners of Woods and Forests. They simply acted up to the rules of the office. As everybody knows, they are a most conscientious body of honourable men, and do their duty to the State in the most perfect way. When the Commissioners were severely taken to task in a debate initiated last year by Lord Harrowby because they had not cut up some of their farms and given people a chance of getting small holdings, I pointed out very respectfully to the noble Lords who made those objections that this was hardly fair, that the Commissioners were probably carrying out the policy they were ordered to carry out, and that the Unionist Government had been in office for the last twenty years, and if they had had a great desire for small holdings the very first thing they would have done would have been to say to the Commissioners, "Go into the open market and find out whether this which we believe to be a fictitious desire for small holdings, this great longing for the land, exists, and if it does it is your duty to satisfy it." In my objection to any censure being passed on these hon. Gentlemen I was backed up by the noble Marquess opposite who, in his own chivalrous way, defended them and said—

> "The Commissioners were instructed to administer the Crown Estates on the most economical principles, and in such a manner as to produce the largest revenue that could be obtained from the land."

Early this year the Prime Minister, with the consent of the Crown, gave over to the Board of Agriculture the management of 62,000 acres of agricultural land in England, and when the Prime Minister gave me over this trust he gave me most distinct and specific orders. He said that of course there was to be great economy in the management, and that the best fair-rent revenue should be derived from the land. But he went further than that, and said that we ought out of the Crown lands to try and show an object lesson as to how small holders might be satisfactorily put on the land, not in any way to oust farmers, or do landlords any harm, but for the practical benefit of the landlords themselves as well as the tenants.

When in the early part of this year I took over the agricultural portion of the estates there were, practically speaking, only forty-four small holdings tenants occupying from 3 to 50 acres of these 62,000 acres, with the exception of a farm to which I shall refer. During the very brief period I have been appointed Commissioner of Crown Agricultural Lands spontaneous applications for small holdings have been received—not applications that we have tried to get—from eleven out of the fourteen different counties in which the Crown agricultural lands under my charge are situated—Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Cheshire, Kent, Lancashire, Lincolnshire, Norfolk, Oxfordshire, Suffolk, Wiltshire, and Yorkshire. I will not trouble the House with the details, which will appear in my Report to be published in June. But may I give a few instances? In South Lincolnshire we have had eighty-seven spontaneous written applications for 2,800 acres of land. The majority of these men at present have only allotments or single plots of land. I shall be told, I suppose, "You know nothing about these people; if you went to London you could get 20,000 men very likely. How do you know these are not bogus men?" In answer to that I say the applicants already own 479 head of stock, in addition to cash, twenty-one of the applicants stating that they possess cash to a total of £3,430, while others state that they can invest £10 an acre in the holding and can produce a bank-book to show it. I trust before the end of the year to have satisfied 50 per cent. of the present demands in this locality without depriving a single farm tenant of his livelihood or of his home. I have received in Yorkshire, from one parish alone, Welwick, fifteen spontaneous applications for 500 acres from residents. In that parish I am informed there are 3,600 acres, 2,000 acres of which are farmed by four farmers, three of whom are non-resident, having farms in other districts. In this case also the majority of the applicants have cash in addition to experience and stock.

During the last few months there was a farm in Cambridgeshire of 917 acres which had been in hand for some years, and I think the experience of most of us is that you do not make much out of a farm in hand. No tenant for this farm could be found anywhere. Mr. C. D. Rose, M.P. for the Newmarket Division, has taken this farm, and at the present moment it has been let to eighty-two tenants either for allotments or small holdings. Very nearly fifty families are now dependent on that land, and still there is in that district an unsatisfied demand, and if I had any more land vacant I should be able at once to let it to satisfactory tenants.

In Wiltshire there was a Crown tenant, who at his own request was released from his farm of 234 acres. The old principle of the office would have been for him to have found a tenant, to whom the farm would have been handed on. I telegraphed down to ask if there was any demand for small holdings, the parish council came up to London, saw me, and we let this farm at once, over the table in my office, to the parish council. It was eagerly taken up, and the council has already let every flower-pot of it and still have more applications.

In Yorkshire a similar instance has occurred, where the local body is taking 500 acres of Crown land for further development, for allotments and small holdings. I really think that these facts prove the statement of the Premier, and show such a strong unsatisfied demand for small holdings throughout the country generally that, without waiting for the Small Holdings Bill which is shortly to be introduced, I have felt it my duty to communicate with each parish, district, and county council in which Crown lands are situated, and to give very serious consideration to a large scheme which is being formulated for dealing with a large demand for small holdings which exists in Cheshire. I hope I have said enough to satisfy the noble Marquess that the case of the Prime Minister has been proved over and over again. If I have been unfortunate enough not to convince the House, I can only ask noble Lords once more to read the official document to which I have referred, but with which I have not ventured to trouble the House.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: We have not got the document.

EARL CARRINGTON: I am certain that every fair-minded man in the House will, after reading the document, agree with me that the Prime Minister was absolutely, totally, and entirely justified in every word he said at the Holborn Restaurant.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: Will the document to which the noble Earl has referred be circulated to this House?

EARL CARRINGTON: Oh, certainly. I will have it circulated to your Lordships. I am indebted to the House for the patience with which my observations have been listened to, and I most respectfully thank the noble Marquess opposite for his promise to assist us, as far as he can, in our endeavours, to use the words of the Prime Minister—

> "Without haste but without rest to cope with and to overcome a state of things which is drifting into a public danger as well as a national disgrace."

THE EARL OF ONSLOW: My Lords, I listened with the greatest interest, as I am sure did all your Lordships, to the noble Earl's statement of the results of his administration of the Crown Lands. I have always held the opinion that it was the duty of the Government in this as in many other matters, such as the employment of labour, to set an example to all, whether they be landowners, employers of labour, or other, in the administration of their affairs; and I have every reason to hope that the noble Earl will be able to show that there is a way of making small holdings in the country an economical success, and I shall look forward with the greatest interest to the Papers which he has promised to lay before the House.

I concur entirely with what my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition said when he expressed great regret that this matter was being treated by His Majesty's Government and by the Leader of His Majesty's Government as a Party affair. I venture to think that a question so serious as this, involving the welfare of so many of His Majesty's subjects in these islands, should, if possible, be treated on non-Party lines. I should like for my part to see a measure brought in from this side of the House—if we are not to see the measure of the Government for some time to come—showing what those who are in opposition to the Government are prepared to do in the way of providing small holdings. And I venture to think that such a measure would largely surprise some of those who have loudly declared that the House of Lords is opposed to any measure for the dissemination of land among the people of the the country.

I regret the diffidence of the noble Earl, who feared to weary your Lordships by reading the statements which he said proved up to the hilt the statement made by the Prime Minister last week. I venture to say that the evidence called in aid by the noble Earl falls entirely under the denomination referred to my noble friend, Lord Lansdowne, in that it consists of nothing but samples. First of all, we have an extract from a Return of 1895, showing that in many cases, county councils were unable to obtain land by agreements, and the document then proceeds to recite what happened in only seven counties out of the whole of the counties of England and Scotland. No mention is made about those county councils who bought land or took steps to acquire it, but found that there were no applicants at all to take it up. Then this document proceeds—

> "Some specific instances of the difficulties experienced by the rural sanitary authorities in obtaining land for allotments before the passing of the Local Government Act of 1894 may be found in the House of Commons' Return of 20th June 1892 (No. 310). Land could not be obtained at all by agreement in the rural disttricts of Buckingham (Bucks), Whittlesey (Cambs.), Braintree (Essex), Tetbury (Glos.), Isle of Thanet and Blean (Kent), Banbury and Thame (Oxford), and Cosford (Sussex)."

Then we are given the evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Small Holdings in 1890, of Mr. Fyffe, the estates bursar of University College, Oxford, regarding an estate in Sussex. But that is no proof of a general disinclination on the part of the landowners of this country to provide land.

Then the document deals with the Report of my Committee, and quotes this extract from my Report on a visit to the small holdings in Worcestershire—

> "The men endeavoured to obtain land from a neighbouring landowner, but a rule on the estate was not to let more than a quarter of an acre to labourers."

I do not wish to mention names, but I may say that that landlord is Lord Plymouth. The rule referred to is well known on the estates of many of your Lordships, but it does not follow from that that my noble friend, Lord Plymouth, was unwilling to let land in larger portions for small holdings. Next we come to the evidence of Miss Jebb. I hope your Lordships will peruse the evidence given by that lady, who visited all the counties of England on the question of small holdings. Some of her evidence is quoted, but not all. This lady said that in nearly every case she found land was just coming into the market, had just come, or was likely to come. There was no proof that there existed any difficulty in obtaining land for small holdings.

Earl CARRINGTON: Read Question 7831.

The Earl of ONSLOW: With pleasure—

> "Q. 7831. Is it your belief that men have gone into the towns because they were unable to get land?—I have certainly met with that in a great many cases."

The difficulty is not in obtaining land for small holdings; the difficulty is in providing suitable buildings to make the land pay. The Salvation Army have been for some time past looking out for an estate which they could cut up into small holdings, and although they have had quantities of land in every part of England offered to them it has not been of a suitable character. They have at last, however, settled on land near Colchester, which is suitable for the purpose. The Committee of the House of Commons of 1890, which was presided over by Mr. Chamberlain, said—

> "We were led to inquire why the interests of owners of land have not naturally brought about a multiplication of small tenancies. There appears to be a general willingness on the part of owners to devote land for the purpose, but the difficulty of providing the necessary buildings is almost insuperable in the present conditions."

Every official document on which the Prime Minister relies is full of evidence of that character—that the owners are willing to give the land, but that the difficulty is the economic one of providing the necessary buildings.

I venture to hope that His Majesty's Government will before long produce their Small Holdings Bill. I think I may say, on behalf of my noble friends behind me, that the Bill, whatever it may be, will not be met in a hostile spirit. I greatly regret the decision of the Government not to introduce the Bill in your Lordships' House, because I am quite sure that by my noble friends who are most anxious to create small holdings in this country it will be received with sympathy, and if it proceeds upon lines which are generally acceptable it will be supported. In your Lordships' House the Bill could be dealt with much earlier than in the other House, where there is a block of business. I hope the Government will reconsider their decision, and either produce their own Bill or give sympathetic consideration to any Bill brought in by my noble friends behind me. Having examined with very great care all the official documents published on this subject, I must say I cannot find one single word to justify the sweeping assertion of the Prime Minister. To say that the landowners of this country as a whole are opposed to utilising their land for the purpose of creating small holdings is a slur upon them under which they cannot be expected quietly to sit down.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of RIPON): My Lords, if no other noble Lord wishes to address the House I will say just a few words in reply to the speech of my noble friend who has just sat down. What the noble Earl said at the end of his speech does not fairly represent anything which fell from my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. My right hon. friend did not imply, and did not intend to imply, any belief that the landlords of this country were as a body indisposed to allow an extension of small holdings.

The question really is a question of sympathy. It is that which has been often wanting in local management. If you look at the facts of the case in regard to the action of county councils, you will observe that in many cases there has been a great readiness to accept the statement that nothing could be done in this matter. I do not say that it is always so; far from it, and there comes in the question of sympathy. Where there has been upon county councils members who have taken up this subject and shown an interest in it, there you will find that something has been done. But it cannot be denied that the Act of 1892 has been a failure. We do not want any proof of that. We have it in the fact that noble Lords opposite when in office appointed the Committee presided over by my noble friend who has just sat down.

Why did they appoint that Committee? We have now had fifteen years experience of the Act of 1892. When the Committee was appointed the Government had had thirteen years experience of the Act, and they had come to the conclusion that the Act had not succeeded. My noble friend behind me, the President of the Board of Agriculture, told your Lordships how many small holdings had been set up throughout the whole of the country by county councils, an absolutely insignificant number. In consequence of that state of things noble Lords opposite appointed this Committee. I think they waited a long time before appointing it. My noble friend Lord Onslow spoke of some of his noble friends bringing in a Bill of their own for the purpose of dealing with this question. I for one shall be very glad to see their Bill when they produce it. I think it is a fair answer to him to say, why was that not done by the late Government? Why did they not do so when they were in office? I lay no blame on my noble friends opposite because their Act failed. I do not think it was an Act ever likely to succeed, and it is absolutely clear that long ago it was established that the Act was practically unworkable.

As I have risen to say a few words on this subject I may, perhaps, be allowed to refer to the speech of the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition. My noble friend distinctly said that the Prime Minister had stated that this difficulty of getting land for small holdings existed throughout the whole country. It is obvious, from the extract from my right hon. friend's speech which the noble Marquess has put upon your Lordships' Paper, that that is not what he said. My right hon. friend said—

> "We hear of this unsatisfied land hunger very largely in the east of England; we hear of it in the Midlands; we hear of it in the southern counties."

That is very far from being a statement that this land hunger exists all over the country. Therefore it is clear that the Prime Minister had no intention of applying his remarks to the whole of England or to landlords as a body. The evidence we have before us shows that in those districts mentioned by the Prime Minister the demand exists for small holdings.

I do not say that any legislation you adopt can be carried out all over the country in a year or two. Of course it cannot. You must proceed step by step. But the foundation must be laid and means must be taken to secure the object which we have in view, and which, apparently, noble Lords opposite are willing to promote—namely, that the system of small holdings should be largely extended in suitable parts of the country. That is the purpose and intention of His

Majesty's Government. I am afraid I cannot satisfy your Lordships as to the contents of our Bill. I must leave that to my right hon. friend Mr. Harcourt, who in a short time will introduce the Bill in the other House.

My noble friend has referred to Miss Jebb, a lady who is thoroughly acquainted with this question. She has written an interesting and valuable book on this question, which I commend to your lordships' consideration. The upshot of the book is, as I understand it, that in many parts of the country the county councils have done very little to excite a demand for small holdings or to make those who might desire them acquainted with the law, and the result has been the small number of small holdings which has been established up to the present time. My noble friend who represents the Board of Agriculture has shown how very much he has already done in respect of the establishment of small holdings on Crown lands. That is a great work and it does not deserve to be treated as if it were merely a matter of chaff. No man in this country has done more in this matter than my noble friend behind me. Besides what he has done in his private capacity, we have had to-day proof of what he has been able to achieve during the short period he has occupied the position of a Commissioner of Crown lands.

I do not object to this discussion. I do not know that is has advanced matters very much, but it has, I hope, shown that there is a certain readiness on the part of noble Lords to consider any proposals with regard to this question. I know there are many persons who say that your Lordships will not listen to anything of the kind. The noble Marquess opposite has spoken about a " crusade." I do not understand that expression.

*The Marquess of LANSDOWNE: It was not mine.

The Marquess of RIPON: I know that; but that does not enable me to understand it better. I have seen a good many assertions in the newspapers that your Lordships will not deal with this question. I have never believed it; I have always believed that your Lordships would give this question the consideration which it deserves. I cannot conceive anything which would be worse for the position or reputation of your Lordships' House than that you should deal hostilely or even indifferently with this question.

The Marquess of LONDONDERRY: My Lords, the debate which has been initiated to-day by my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition has not been entirely without fruit. I go further and say that in the interest, not only of those Members of your Lordships' House who are interested in land, but in the interest of the whole agricultural community, be they owners, occupiers, or labourers, a debate such as this was absolutely necessary in order that the statements made by the Prime Minister on Saturday last should be freely and fully discussed in Parliament.

The noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture took exception to the observation of my noble friend behind me, that the speech of the Prime Minister was of an unnecessarily provocative character. I venture to assert that no impartial person interested in the question of land tenure could regard the Prime Minister's speech as anything but a direct attack upon one class of the community; more especially as the right hon. Gentleman went out of his way to declare that the Government intended to carry on a crusade against that class. I do not think any other construction could be put on what he said. What is the crusade to be? The Prime Minister seems to me to be endeavouring to force an open door, and to compel owners of property to give that which they are gladly giving—their support to the creation of small holdings. The question of small holdings is a very important one, and noble Lords on this side of the House have not the slightest intention of putting any obstacle in the way of their creation.

It has been said that owners of property have denied opportunities for the creation of small holdings. I am at a loss to know on what ground that statement is based. The crusade referred to by the Prime Minister is not a crusade intended really to benefit agriculturists; it is a crusade against certain Members of your Lordships' House because they are owners of property. The problem of small holdings is a very difficult one to solve. As the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture has told us, localities vary, and consequently you cannot legislate for all districts alike. The varying conditions of different localities have to be considered. I am convinced that no noble Lord opposite will contradict me when I say that what we desire is to make the tenants of small holdings prosperous. If that is to be done we must consider the situation, and also the condition of the people. In certain parts of the country where there are small holdings the tenants derive a considerable portion of their income from working on the land of the larger farmers. Those conditions should be taken into account, and we should consider whether, if that income derived by the smaller man is taken away from him on account of the large farms being broken up, he will be able to exist at all. In a great number of cases these men would become paupers.

The Paper which has been supplied to my hon. friend Mr. Lane-Fox, and which has been frequently referred to in the course of this debate, contains only what I should call ancient *data*. Every instance quoted occurred in the nineties. and the majority in the early nineties; nothing is quoted after the year 1900, The document does not meet the requirements of the case at the present time. Seven years have elapsed since the most recent case mentioned in that Report. The cases quoted may have been selected specially for the purpose of the Prime Minister, but I maintain that if you go into the question more fully you will find many cases to the contrary and quite antagonistic to the views put forward by the Prime Minister.

I have not heard in the course of this debate any reference to the Committee which sat last autumn and went very closely into the question. I should like to hear from the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council, whether any witness before that Committee stated that there had been a "blank denial" given by any landlord to an application for land. Before such an expression as that is used the charge ought to be proved up to the hilt. Statistics show that to a great extent the contrary is the case. In the memorandum of the Co-operative Small Holdings Society presented to Lord Onslow's Committee we read that—

> "As a result of the Allotments Acts, 1887 and 1890, the Small Holdings Act, 1892, and the Local Government Act, 1894, a mass of experience has now been accumulated in England; between 20,000 and 30,000 acres have been acquired by local authorities, and let to from 50,000 to 60,000 tenants."

That does not look like a "blank denial." Again, in the same memorandum we read that—

> "During the ten years from 1887 to 24th June, 1897, district councils, parish councils, and county councils have acquired 15,216 acres, and let them to 29,925 tenants."

I quote those figures as showing that when these demands have been made they have not been met by a "blank denial." Such an assertion it would be very difficult for the Prime Minister to prove. Only a few moments ago the noble Marquess the Leader of the House declared that there was difficulty in obtaining land in the Midlands.

THE MARQUESS OF RIPON: I quoted the districts mentioned by the Prime Minister.

THE MARQUESS OF LONDONDERRY: I have in my hand a document supplied to me by my noble friend the Duke of Rutland relating to the Midland counties. It states that of holdings of from 100 to 150 acres fifty have been taken; of from fifty to 100 acres, thirty-nine have been taken; of from thirty to fifty acres, twenty-five; of from fifteen to thirty acres, forty-seven; of from ten to fifteen acres, fifty-five; and there are about 250 holdings from one to ten acres. I think that is sufficient to disprove the statement that it is impossible to obtain holdings in the Midland counties. The statement that the demand for land for this purpose has been met by blank denial is unworthy of a Prime Minister.

I agree with my noble friend behind me that your Lordships, no matter on which side of the House you sit, are only too anxious to promote the welfare of those connected with our great national industry; but in endeavouring to promote the prosperity of agriculture we should act harmoniously, and speeches should not be made for political purposes which tend to do considerable damage to agriculture. The sort of speeches in question do infinite harm. But I believe that such speeches will be thoroughly understood by the agricultural classes, and that when the time comes for you to ask for the verdict of agriculturists they will speak with no uncertain voice. I trust the day is not far distant when you will ask them to tell you what they think of your proposals, and I look forward with absolute confidence to the result.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I do not desire to prolong this discussion. I simply rise to ask a question. The Prime Minister, in the two extracts from his speech which the noble Marquess has put upon the Paper, says that from one district after another, as official Returns show, the demand for land for the purposes of use and labour is met by blank denial. He went on to say that there is a whole mass of official testimony to show that a strong demand exists. A Paper has been circulated to the other House of Parliament, and the question which I wish to ask is whether that Paper contains the whole of the evidence upon which the rather startling statements of the Prime Minister were made. I may be put down as not easily satisfied, but, having read this Paper through, I confess myself wholly unconvinced that it shows the slightest warrant for these strong allegations.

I am not very familiar with all the Acts which are referred to in this Paper, but I venture to say that not only in this Paper, but throughout the discussion to-night two wholly different things have been mixed up—namely, allotments and small holdings. I think it desirable that all the references in this Paper should show on the face of them whether they refer to allotments or to small holdings. The Paper contains only two or three extracts referring to small holdings, yet the Prime Minister must have been speaking of small holdings rather than of allotments, because allotments by themselves would certainly not check rural depopulation. I do not believe that the demand for allotments is in many cases an unsatisfied demand. If the Prime Minister's speech meant anything at all, it meant to prepare the way for a measure which was to increase the number of small holdings as distinct from allotments, and I fail to find any evidence at all in this Paper that there is this general demand, or this mass of official testimony as to the refusal of land for small holdings.

The real difficulty about small holdings is the economic difficulty—the cost of changing from one system to another; and no discussion can go far which does not take account of that great difficulty. The extract from the letter of the parish council, which is the only testimony of recent date, fills me with astonishment, and I wish we could have some further explanation in regard to it. We are told here that the rents paid by existing small holders run to £5 per acre, including house and buildings. Can any noble Lord opposite tell me where small holders, as distinct from holders of allotments, are paying £5 an acre, even including house and buildings? If there was any chance of getting £5 an acre for any land that I know of, the landowners would be tumbling over each other in the hope of establishing small holdings on those terms. What I am suspicious of is that these are not occupants of small holdings, but allotment holders. It seems to me worthy of inquiry, if £5 an acre can be got from small holders, how it is that there is not a great rush to supply that demand. If there is really this great quantity of official testimony, if there is this number of official returns, the Paper which I hold in my hand is really a very meagre answer to the request for information. If there is this universal failure to satisfy the demand, surely we can have some further information than is given in this Paper presented to the House of Commons.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, perhaps even at this late hour it is desirable that at any rate one other speaker on this side should say a word in reply to the last two speeches. As regards the general impression which seems to have been left on the minds of the noble Lords opposite by the speech of the Prime Minister, I can only say that I had the pleasure of listening to that speech, and it appeared to me, as I heard it, to be couched in very moderate terms. I did not recognise in it any note of provocation. It is perfectly true that the Prime Minister spoke strongly, as he felt strongly, with regard to what he believes, and what we believe, to be the need for extending the system of small holdings and the difficulty which attends that extension; but I think noble Lords opposite have been somewhat too ready to look out for something in the nature of provocation in the speech, and they have really in some cases—I am sure without the faintest intention of doing so—twisted the Prime Minister's words into a sense which they were not intended to bear.

The noble Marquess Lord Londonderry assumed that my right hon. friend's phrase "blank denial" referred entirely to the landowners' attitude towards the request for small holdings. My right hon. friend said nothing of the kind. What, I take it, was in his mind when he used that phrase was the failure of public authorities to find a proper supply of land under the Act of noble Lords opposite. Then my noble friend Lord Balfour complained of what he considered to be the meagre character of the information given in the Paper presented to the House of Commons. I really do not see what my right hon friend could do more. He gave in his speech instances of certain districts in which there was an unsatisfied demand for small holdings, and in the printed Paper he has given certain instances applying to those districts, and that was his particular reply. As regards his general reply, I would refer your Lordships to paragraph 125 of the Report of the Departmental Committee. That paragraph reads as follows—

> "The Committee further made inquiry as to whether there exists in all parts of the country an unsatisfied demand for land, whether to rent or to purchase. It was made evident to the Committee that in some parts where for years past the division of land into small holdings has been energetically pursued, the demand has been overtaken; on the other hand a very large body of the evidence goes to show that in many places more land of the kind already divided into small holdings would be taken up with avidity, especially if properly equipped and offered for hire with a reasonable security of tenure."

I do not know that my right hon. friend ever suggested that the land should not be properly equipped, and when your Lordships see our Small Holdings Bill I hope you will find that such provision must necessarily be made.

Then Lord Balfour stated that he was astonished at a rent of £5 an acre being

The Earl of Crewe.

asked for small holdings. Perhaps I might give him an instance from my own district. It is a painful one to me, because it applied to a piece of land I desired to purchase and afterwards did buy. It was a small holding, freehold, of six acres, with not very good buildings and a small orchard. It was three miles from any considerable town, and was let by the townsman who owned it to a tenant for £36 a year. That is not £5 an acre but £6. I can assure the noble Lord that rents of that amount are by no means infrequently asked, and the astonishing thing to me is that they should be obtained, but they undoubtedly are in some cases. I really do not think that there is any desire on the part of noble Lords opposite to dispute the general proposition that there is, in some parts of England, an unsatisfied demand for small holdings, and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, if his speech is read carefully, did not go further than that.

My noble friend the President of the Board of Agriculture has told the House of the remarkable demand that has been made upon the Crown lands since he has been in charge of the agricultural part of those lands, and it certainly does seem to me a reasonable deduction to draw that, if spontaneous demands of that kind are made in the case of Crown lands situated in many different parts of the country, similar demands for land in private hands would be made if it was any use making them. But everybody is aware that, in a great many cases, people who desire small holdings know very well that it would not be very much use making a demand of the kind. Landlords in a great many cases would say—and I am bound to admit that I greatly sympathise with their position myself—"You are asking a great deal in desiring us to disturb an excellent tenant, whose family has been on this farm for generations, in order to cut up the farm into small holdings." Consequently the demand is not made. I could not help being somewhat amused by the observation which fell from the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition on this matter of disturbing tenant farmers, when he said that farmers did not like to be deprived of their own. I have not heard before in this House the kind of interest which a farmer has in his yearly tenancy described as his own.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The Bill of last year.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I venture to think that if such a phrase had been used in the debates of last year, the hair of noble Lords opposite would have stood on end with horror. Objection has been taken to my right hon. friend's description of the work which has to be undertaken in this matter as a crusade. I think it may fairly be described as a crusade—not a crusade against landlords, but a crusade against the apathy which has existed in many parts of the country in this matter, and I cannot help thinking that the noble Marquess in his opening speech did somewhat underrate the very considerable objection which is felt by many people to dividing their estates into small holdings. First and foremost there is the difficulty of expense. It is perfectly true that a large number of landlords cannot afford, even by the various means of borrowing which are open to landlords, to put up the necessary buildings, but at the same time I am bound to say that I think the matter does go somewhat beyond that, and that there is in the minds of a good many landowners—the smaller rather than the larger landowners—a feeling that small holdings are more troublesome to manage, and present to the landowner a certain number of objections of different kinds which do not apply to larger farms. That is the cause of what I have ventured to call apathy, which does not amount to denial, but to a want of interest in the matter, which I am afraid has touched the landowning class, and which has undoubtedly touched public bodies.

We on this side of the House certainly make no complaint that this question has been raised, and I hope we have succeeded in making the matter somewhat clearer, and in presenting the speech of the Prime Minister in a more favourable light to the minds of noble Lords opposite. The Marquess of Londonderry and the Earl of Onslow have appealed to us to treat this matter on non-Party lines. That is an appeal which is very often made, but it is always made by those in Opposition. I have never heard it made by any Party when holding office. Certainly we do not want to treat it on unnecessarily controversial lines, and when our Bill comes before this House I hope we may look with well-grounded confidence for the assistance of noble Lords opposite.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: I do not wish to press the noble Earl unduly, but he did not answer the question whether there is any further evidence, in addition to what is in this Paper, which can be produced.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I cannot give an answer off-hand.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I will not take up the time of the House by attempting to reconcile the different interpretations which have been placed on the Prime Minister's speech. I may take it from the noble Earl who has just spoken that the remarkable phrase about "blank denial" which I quoted in my Notice had no reference to the landowners of this country.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I scarcely went so far as that. I said I believed that what was in my right hon. friend's mind was the refusal on the part of the county councils. I have no doubt instances could be found both ways.

*THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: The noble Earl is in a better position to fathom the recesses of the Prime Minister's mind than I can be; but I think that nine people out of ten who read that speech would have interpreted it, as most of your Lordships have interpreted it, as a suggestion that it was the landowners who were to blame for the denial of land for the purpose of small holdings. May I be excused if I do what is sometimes done when the sense of a document is a little obscure? May I be allowed to collate that speech with a speech delivered in the evening by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, who was, apparently, speaking from the same brief? The Under-Secretary for the Colonies delivered himself of this sentiment—

> "They—His Majesty's Government—had no intention of plundering the landlord, and they had no intention of allowing him to plunder them."

That is rather a remarkable sentence read in the light of the Prime Minister's previous utterance. But I understand now that we are to take it that the crusade is not against landlords, but that it is a moral crusade against apathy and indifference and similar qualities. What I really rose for was for the purpose of expressing my hope that His Majesty's Government will, on reflection, see their way to give the House information a great deal fuller than that contained in the extremely meagre Paper which has been in some of your Lordships' hands this evening. It is quite clear that there must be a great deal more information, and the oral statements to which we have listened this evening have failed altogether to give us the information we wanted. We have failed altogether to obtain from His Majesty's Government a statement of the extent to which the difficulty of obtaining land for small holdings really can be traced to the attitude of persons who own land and who are reluctant to part with it. Therefore we hope for more information. The particular cases cited were exactly the kind we expected would be cited. They were samples, and may I say they were samples that would not wash? The noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture actually had to go for his leading case, not to the estate of a landowner, but to an estate owned by a public Department; and the noble Marquess who leads the House expatiated upon the shortcomings of the county councils, who, he said, were much too ready to assume that a difficulty would be experienced in obtaining suitable land. The noble Marquess also told us that the last Act had fallen short of our expectations. These are all things which are perfectly arguable, but they are not statements which meet the point we raised—the point, I mean, of how far the demand for land for this purpose has been stifled by the action of the landowners of the country.

COUNTY COUNCILS AND SMALL HOLDINGS.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN rose to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he would lay upon the Table the answers of the County Councils of England and of Scotland to the circular recently issued by the Board with reference to Small Holdings as soon as such answers were received.

The noble Earl said: My Lords, like my noble friend Lord Lansdowne I think it is very desirable that we should have much more complete information than we have at the present time with regard to this question. The noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture has recently issued an important circular to all the county councils of England and Scotland with reference to the Report of the Departmental Committee on Small Holdings. As many of your Lordships may not have seen this circular I ask permission to be allowed to read the important part of it. It is signed by the Secretary to the Board of Agriculture, who writes—

> "I desire to call the attention of county councils to this Report, and in particular to the observations contained therein with reference to the present administration of the Small Holdings Act, 1892. The Committee make certain recommendations for the amendment of the Act, with the object of giving further powers and wider discretion to county councils for the provision of small holdings. These and other proposals for legislation are under the consideration of the Board, but in the meantime I am to invite the attention of your council to the suggestions and recommendations made by the Committee."

He proceeds—

> "The Committee recommend that an annual inquiry be made by the small holdings committee of the county council from the minor authorities within the county as to the land occupied by small holders, as to whether there is a demand for further land, and as to any land available for this purpose. I am to suggest that the small holdings committee of your council might with advantage proceed to make such an inquiry from the minor authorities as is recommended."

I think that demand on the part of the Board of Agriculture is a most reasonable and proper one, and I am only surprised that it had not occurred to them before.

Ever since the present Government have been in office it has been openly intended to introduce a Small Holdings Bill for Scotland, and also one for England. The Scottish Bill has been in existence since August last, and it is very strange that it should occur only now to the noble Earl to ask the county councils to make this inquiry for him. One would naturally suppose from the circular, the substance of which I have read to your Lordships, that the noble Earl wished the inquiry made for his information. But the noble Earl has not waited for the answers. Not only has the Scottish Bill been read a first time in the other House, but the English Bill has been prepared and is in draft.

I was surprised to hear from the Front Bench opposite that His Majesty's Ministers could not tell us what the proposals of their Bill are. I do not know whether the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies was appointed to assist my noble friend opposite, but on Saturday last, when addressing an audience which cannot be supposed to have been very skilled in information on this point, the hon. Gentleman said he would tell them what the Bill was; and he did, for he said the local authorities were to be empowered to buy land, and so on. We know that it is to be entirely different from the Scottish proposal. We find it very difficult indeed to get any facts which bear on these Bills, and it is absolutely essential, in dealing with changes which the Prime Minister himself described as formidable, that we should have minute information as to the necessity of making these changes, and the grounds on which they are proposed. It is for that reason that I hope the noble Earl will lay on the Table of the House the answers he receives from the county councils as soon as they come to hand, because we cannot proceed to consider such important Bills as those which have been foreshadowed without having adequate information as to whether the demand is and how far it is likely to be met without resorting to extreme measures.

Earl CARRINGTON: My Lords, I am very glad to be able to inform the noble Earl that I shall have the greatest pleasure in laying these Reports on the Table. Of course, the noble Earl will allow me to do so at my own time, but as soon as I possibly can I will lay the Reports on the Table, as I am extremely anxious that the subject should be ventilated in every way. Perhaps I may be allowed also to answer my noble friend Lord Balfour, who asked if there was any further information. I can promise him that in the Paper which will be laid on the Table of your Lordships' House we will add a reference to all the Parliamentary Reports that we have, and upon which the statement of the Prime Minister was made.

Lord BALFOUR of BURLEIGH: I am much obliged to the noble Earl for his answer, and I hope that he will carefully distinguish between references to allotments and to small holdings, because the really important point in this matter is the economic difficulty with regard to small holdings.

The Earl of CAMPERDOWN: I have to thank the noble Earl for promising to lay on the Table the information for which I asked. We must, of course, bow to his convenience, but at the same time I think it is essential that these Reports should be laid on the Table in plenty of time for us to consider them before the Bills are brought before the House. I would throw out for the noble Earl's consideration the suggestion that it would be desirable to circulate the answers from the county councils in instalments.

GRANTS FOR TRAINING COLLEGES.

Lord MONK BRETTON rose to ask the Lord President of the Council whether, with reference to the Regulations of the Board of Education on the subject of grants in aid for buying sites and building training colleges, he could make any statement with regard to grants in aid for the building or purchase of hostels in connection with existing training colleges.

The noble Earl said: My Lords, in the regulations to which I refer a grant of 75 per cent. is made in respect of all capital expenditure incurred by the local authorities for the provision of sites and buildings for training colleges, subject to certain conditions to which I need not now refer. It appears perfectly plain-sailing, but the fact that the regulations are not without a pitfall is shown by the experience of an education authority in which I am interested. The County Council of East Sussex had to arrange last year to provide this year for the training of forty teachers. Forty teachers are a very uneconomic number to train, because it is as expensive to provide training college accommodation for forty as for eighty teachers. Therefore the best thing they could do was to amalgamate with somebody else, and this is what the County Council of East Sussex endeavoured to do.

There exists at Brighton a training college which the education authority believes to be one of the best institutions of its kind in England. They accordingly went to this college and made arrangements that the college should take the forty teachers and train them, whilst they were to be lodged in an hostel near by. For this purpose the college authorities were induced to spend money for the accommodation of the teachers, and the education authority went to the expense of acquiring a building in Brighton for the purpose of a hostel. It never occurred to them for one moment that this arrangement would not come under the grant of 75 per cent. in respect of all capital expenditure for training colleges. Owing to certain action by the Board of Education last year, the county council began to suspect that possibly hostels might not be covered by the regulations. They therefore wrote to the Board of Education and received an answer in the negative. There would, they were told, be no grant under the regulations for hostels. This was very disappointing to the county council, who had spent the money of the ratepayers and also induced the college authorities to spend money in this matter.

Then, in another place, Sir William Anson asked a Question on the subject and was told by Mr. Birrell—this was in December—that the Board of Education were seriously considering the giving of grants in respect of hostels. Nothing more happened for three months, during which time the county council were on the tiptoe of expectation. In March another Question was asked in the House of Commons, this time by a member of the noble Earl's own Party, and Mr. McKenna, in reply, said the Question was under consideration. Another month has elapsed. The matter has become a very serious one to the local education authority, who have been misled by the regulations. They do not know whether they are going to get their grant or not. The curriculum for teachers begins in September, but teachers have to be engaged in the beginning of the year. Consequently all these months at the beginning of this year have been lost.

I would lay stress on the great inconvenience caused by this delay, and I wish, in conclusion, to assure the noble Earl that this education authority did not go to this particular training college on any religious grounds whatever, but because they believed it to be the most efficient, the most economical, and the best way of providing this training. If the noble Earl cannot give an Answer now, I do appeal to him to endeavour to let us know the decision of the Board of Education at any rate before the Whitsuntide recess.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: My Lords, the point which the noble Lord opposite has raised, with particular reference to the East Sussex County Council, is one of no small importance, and it is one, of course, which cannot be decided by reference to a special instance, however greatly aggrieved a particular local authority may consider itself to be by the incidence of the law. The noble Lord stated what the circumstances were, and he used only one phrase to which I must take exception. He said the County Council of East Sussex had been misled by the regulations. I think that was scarcely a fair phrase to use, because it clearly would have been open to them, if they had any doubt as to the interpretation of the regulations—and I think it can hardly be disputed that there was, at any rate, a possibility of the law being as it is declared to be—to ask the Board of Education what the regulations meant before incurring this expense.

We are very sorry that this case should have occurred and that inconvenience should have been caused to the East Sussex County Council, and I fully accept what was stated by the noble Lord, that in this particular case the matter was simply one of administrative convenience and that the difficult religious question did not enter into it. But I must remind the noble Lord that as a matter of fact these questions do arise in a great many other cases, and the whole question of whether support ought to be given out of public funds to these hostels is one of not merely considerable difficulty, but one which, I am afraid, is likely to give rise to some controversy.

Perhaps I may just give the House a brief history of what has passed, and an account of the present position. The noble Lord is aware that in the Regulations of 1905 building grants were given to training colleges, but only to the amount of 25 per cent., and those were limited to the site or such buildings of a college as were required for residential purposes. In 1906 the grants were increased to 75 per cent. of the whole cost of a residential college as well as a day college ; but those grants were restricted to colleges provided by the local authorities. There are three reasons which have actuated the Board in giving grants for the residential work of training colleges as well as for their more purely and strictly educational work. In the first place, we desire to encourage local authorities to combine for the provision of training colleges, and that, of course, means that a considerable number of the students in such a case must live away from home. In the second place, we consider that corporate life—an important element in education—can only be secured in a residential college, especially for such students as are under consideration in this particular matter ; and, in the third place, so far as rural areas are concerned, it is in a residential college, and a residential college alone, that the only possible system of training can be given. Those considerations, as the noble Lord will see, do tell in favour of making building grants to hostels as well as to residential colleges.

But there is another side to the question which specially appeals to some people. Some people say that, after all, a hostel may be nothing more than a mere boarding establishment, and that all those advantages which I have mentioned relating to the corporate life of the community therefore do not apply in such a case. On the other hand, of course, if a building grant were provided I fully admit that the Board of Education could secure that such hostels that were aided were organised on proper educational lines. There is also this to be remembered. Some training colleges are organised as departments of Universities or University colleges. These are invariably day colleges, and satisfactory provision for the students attending such colleges can really only be made by means of hostels. That is especially desirable in large cities, and it is important that supervision should be exercised over the lodging of students. Those are further arguments in favour of extending the scope of the building grants to cover hostels.

On the other hand, it is maintained by some, and no doubt there is considerable force in the argument—which, of course, tells against giving the building grant—that the work of supervising that side (the recreative side) of the life of the student is work which is particularly well done by voluntary agencies ; and, as a matter of fact, in connection with several Universities and also University colleges, the halls of residence which have sprung up of late years have been conducted as a rule by private individuals licensed by the University authorities, and are carried on on denominational lines. I think it must be assumed that it would not be possible for the State to give building grants in aid of hostels provided by voluntary authorities, because, as the noble Lord will remember, it has already been decided that the building grants to training colleges are in future to be confined to those provided by local education authorities.

That being so, I am inclined to think that many people will be of opinion that it really is better for the State to leave the local education authorities and the voluntary bodies to act as, I hope, friendly rivals, but as rivals on equal terms so far as providing hostels are concerned, rather than to give the hostels provided by the local authorities the advantage of a building grant. That is an argument which I have no doubt will appeal to a great many people. On the other hand, it is doubtful if the supply of hostels is likely to be provided in due time by voluntary agency. It is also, no doubt, true that the kind of hostel which is most likely to be provided is pretty sure to be run as a denominational hostel, and that therefore there might be students who would desire to reside in an undenominational hostel and that local authorities would be unwilling to provide such undenominational hostels unless they were helped by Government grants.

LORD MONK BRETTON: In the present case the teaching is undenominational in the training college.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: That applies to this particular case, but not to every case, and we are obliged to look at the position all over England. I have endeavoured to summarise the arguments for and against, and I think your Lordships will agree that the matter is by no means an easy one to decide. I can assure the noble Lord that there has been no undue delay. The Board still has the matter under consideration. I am afraid I cannot at this moment make any announcement to him as to the time at which the decision of the Board will be reached, but I can assure him that, in consequence of the question which he has put and of the undoubtedly hard case brought forward, I will endeavour to hasten the matter, in order that I may be able to give him a definite Answer as soon as possible.

RULE COMMITTEE BILL [H.L.]

Read 3ª (according to order), and passed, and sent to the Commons.

House adjourned at half-past Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 25th April, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (MONEY) BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH.)

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz. :—London County Council (Money) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILL [LORDS] (STANDING ORDER 68 NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order 68 has not been complied with, viz. :—Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill.—Read the third time, and passed.

West Riding Tramways Bill [Lords].—Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill.—As amended, considered ; to be read the third time.

London Port and Docks Bill (by order).—Order for resuming adjourned Debate on Amendment to Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed] ; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill.—Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed] ; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow.

West Yorkshire Tramways Bill [Lords] ; Folkestone, Sandgate, and Hythe Tramways Bill [Lords] ; Burnley Corporation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments ; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Brecon and Merthyr Tydvil Junction Railway Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended] ; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bristol Corporation Bill.—Reported, with Amendments [Title amended] ; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, " An Act to amend the Law with respect to the Court of Appeal." [Judicature Bill] [Lords.]

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, &c.) Bill and Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill.—That they have appointed a Committee consisting of Five Lords, to join with a Committee of the Commons, pursuant to Message of this House, to consider the Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, &c.) Bill and the Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill, and propose that the said Joint Committee do meet in Committee

Room A on Thursday next, at Three o'clock.

Lords' Message considered.

Ordered, That the Committee of this House do meet the Lords' Committee as proposed by their Lordships.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS) BILL.

Petition from Chelsea, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petition from Chelsea, against; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against: From Kilsyth; Lanark; Rothesay; and Stranraer; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Aberdeen (four); Bathgate; Bellshill; Berwick upon Tweed; Brechin; Campbeltown; Coatbridge; Dalziel; Dumfries (two); Dumfries and Maxwelltown; Dundee; Edinburgh (three); Falkirk (two); Forfar; Glasgow (seven); Govan; Grangemouth; Hilton; Lanark; Logerait; Montrose; Nairn; Neilston; North Berwick; North British District Temperance Committee; Peebles; Perth; Prestonpans; Rothesay; Saltcoats; Strathpeffer; Tough; Troon; Whiteinch Cross (two); and Wick; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition from London, against; to lie upon the Table.

PATENTS AND DESIGNS BILL.

Petition from Glasgow, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from Bucklow, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

WOMEN'S ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

Petition from North Medway, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

POLICE (COUNTIES AND BOROUGHS, ENGLAND AND WALES).

Copy presented, of Reports of His Majesty's Inspectors of Constabulary for the year ended 29th September, 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 128.]

IRELAND DEVELOPMENT GRANT ACT, 1903.

Copy presented, of Report of the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland of all his Proceedings under the Act, for the year ended 31st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

OCCUPIERS OF FARMS (SCOTLAND).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th December, 1906; *Mr. Sinclair*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 127.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

St. George's School, Ramsgate.

Mr. ALDEN (Middlesex, Tottenham): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that the underground rooms at St. George's School, Ramsgate, which the Board have condemned, and which they notified the local education authority would not be recognised after 1st February, 1904, are still in use, and that the children of those parents who claim free education are obliged to attend school in these cellar rooms; whether he is aware that the temporary iron building, Ellington School, Ramsgate, which the Board have so strongly condemned, and which they notified the local education authority would not be recognised after 1st March, 1907, is still in use; and, whether he proposes to take steps to compel the local education authority to provide suitable buildings for the needs of the town.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I believe it is a fact that the rooms referred to are still in use pending the provision of a new school. The Board are in communication with the local education authority as to the site upon which this school is to be built, and every effort will be made to expedite its completion.

Lead Poisoning in Dockyards.

Mr. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will state how many cases of lead poisoning have been treated by the surgeons of Portsmouth, Devonport, Chatham, Sheerness, and Pembroke dockyards, respectively, during the year 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Number of cases of lead poisoning treated during the year 1906 at—

Portsmouth - - -	7
Devonport - - -	3
Keyham - - - -	2
Chatham - - - -	2
Sheerness - -	Nil
Pembroke - - -	2

Estate of Mr. T. R. P. Phibbs Collooney, Sligo.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have decided to purchase the estate of Mr. T. R. P. Phibbs, Heathfield, Collooney, County Sligo; is he aware that there are on this estate a number of uneconomic holdings, and that the estate comprises a considerable area of untenanted land suitable for the enlargement of small holdings on the estate; has all the untenanted land been offered by the vendor for sale to the Estates Commissioners, and have steps been taken to secure an equitable distribution of it amongst the occupiers of uneconomic holdings; and will he instruct the Commissioners to give notice of the particulars of the proposed scheme of redistribution of the untenanted portions to all concerned before the sale is completed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The estate of Mr. T. R. P. Phibbs is being sold by the owner direct to the tenants under Section 1. The estate has been inspected and the matter has been before the Estates Commissioners for some time. There are several uneconomic holdings on the estate, and the Commissioners have been endeavouring to arrange for their enlargement, but up to the present have been unable to get the tenants to agree to the suggested arrangements. It is proposed that portion of the untenanted land on the estate should be used for the enlargement of holdings, and that portion should be resold to the owner. As the consent of the tenants to the proposed rearrangement is necessary they will be fully informed of the Commissioners' suggestions.

Killeenan Post Office.

Mr. KETTLE (Tyrone E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the recent closing of the post office at Killeenan, County Tyrone, has caused inconvenience and dissatisfaction in the district; and whether he will take steps to have it restored.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The rule of the department is that the sub-postmaster or sub-postmistress must be the tenant of the property in which the Post Office work is conducted. It appeared that in this case this rule has not been observed. It was also thought that the sub-postmistress was too old to continue to perform the duties satisfactorily, while it was found that very little use was made by the public of the post office at Killeenan. It was, therefore, decided to close the office, an improvement being made at the same time in the deliveries of the district.

Income-Tax.

Mr. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer how much he estimates to receive into the Exchequer by the new regulations as to compulsory returns of income by individuals and employers.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) No estimate can at present be formed of the effect on the Revenue of the proposed new regulations.

s

Financial Reserve.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state the present position and extent of the funds, gold, silver, gold bars, and silver ingots and securities jointly designated as the gold currency reserve; what was the total amount of that fund on 31st March, and what proportions thereof are held in India and England, respectively; and if it is intended that this reserve should be allowed to increase indefinitely, or is some automatic limit contemplated as to period or total amount.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The composition of the gold standard reserve on the 31st March, 1907, was as follows:—

	£
In England.	
British Government securities, worth at their then market values, about -	11,983,000
In India.	
600 lakhs of rupees - -	4,000,000
Gold to the value of about -	300,000
Total, about - -	£16,283,000

It is not intended to add to the amount held in rupees. As regards the invested portion, indefinite increase is not contemplated, but it is not desirable that further accumulation should be stopped for the present, and no decision has yet been arrived at as to the limit that should be imposed.

Gublaun Police.

Mr. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what is the last occasion on which the police stationed at Gublaun, county Leitrim, were called on to exercise their official functions in the maintenance of peace in the district.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The last prosecution by the police at this station was for an offence committed on 14th November, 1906.

Irish Grants-in-Aid—Deductions.

Mr. KILBRIDE (Kildare, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain how the deductions of £8,464 12s. 9d. from Kildare County Council were apportioned between the Agricultural Grant, from which £5,507 4s. 6d. was withheld, and the Death Duty Grant, from which £2,957 8s. 3d. was withheld; and how it arises that only four counties in Ireland suffered by withdrawal of Agricultural Grant.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Death Duty Grant is the first portion and the Agricultural Grant the second portion of the Guarantee Fund from which deductions are made in respect of a county's liability for land purchase. The share of Kildare county in the instalment of the Death Duty Grant recently distributed amounted to £2,957 8s. 3d., and as this was not sufficient to discharge the county's liability the balance, namely, £5,507 4s. 6d., had to be taken from the Agricultural Grant. In four other counties the Death Duty Grant was likewise insufficient and the remainder had to be taken from the Agricultural Grant, but in all the remaining counties the Death Duty Grant was more than enough.

Kilmallock Labourers' Cottages.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid).: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that certain difficulties have arisen in the Kilmallock rural district, and that disappointment has been caused to deserving labourers in connection with the administration of the Labourers Act of last year; is it alleged on behalf of the labourers that the financial resources of the district council are not being employed to their full extent for the provision of cottages and allotments, together with the additional half acre for cottages already built; has he received a resolution from Mr. John Hogan, honorary secretary, East Limerick Committee of the Land and Labour Association, requesting that he should receive a deputation representative of the labourers' organisation to discuss the defects in the Labourers' Acts in their particular relation to the Kilmallock rural districts; will he state what action he intends to take in the matter; and whether he proposes to receive the deputation referred to.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have received some complaints as to the rejection by the rural district council of representations made by labourers, and have informed the persons who complained that it is open to them to attend the local inquiry and lay their case before the inspector. No complaints, however, have been made to the Board that any difficulties have arisen in the administration of the Act of last year, or that the financial resources of the district council are not being employed to their full extent. I received a letter from the local Irish Land and Labour Association, and replied that, before considering whether I could usefully receive a deputation, I should wish to be furnished with a written statement giving full particulars of the alleged defects to which they desire to call my attention. I have to-day received a statement on the subject, but have not yet had time to consider it.

Ballinageeragh Disturbances.

Mr. ARKWRIGHT (Hereford): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the 4th instant two patrols of police from Ballinageeragh were attacked by a crowd in the course of their duty of serving summonses in a case where a woman had been assaulted for serving the police with milk; whether the Constable Conboy is still detained in Macroom Hospital on account of injuries then received; whether the justices of the peace adjourned the case against the persons accused of this assault and released them on bail; and whether he has received the protests of the district inspector and the resident magistrate.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed that the facts are substantially as stated. The accused were brought before local magistrates, who remanded them on bail to petty sessions on 19th instant. They duly appeared at the sessions and were returned for trial at the next assizes. No protests have been made by the district inspector and resident magistrate.

Suffolk Artillery Militia Training.

Mr. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for War if the Prince of Wales' Own Norfolk Royal Garrison Artillery Militia, which is to train at Great Yarmouth from 20th May to 8th June, and the Suffolk Artillery Militia, which will train at Harwich from the 10th to the 29th June, will each receive the same amount of ammunition for gun practice at their trainings as in former years.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) As gun practice has been dispensed with in the case of the Garrison Artillery Militia for the forthcoming training, no gun ammunition will be issued to those regiments.

United States Pensions.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can inform the House what is the sum now paid for pensions by the Government of the United States; and what were the corresponding sums ten years ago, twenty years ago, and thirty years ago respectively.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) From the printed reports published by the United States Government, and therefore accessible to the hon. Member, it would appear that the sum paid for pensions during the financial year which ended on the 30th of June last was $141,034,561.77.

The corresponding sums in the past were—

1896 - -	$138,220,704.46
1886 - -	$64,091,142.90
1876 - -	$27,936,249.53

Punishment of Youthful Offenders.

Mr. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, with reference to the Return of youthful offenders sentenced during the last three months of 1906, whether he will state, in the case of each of the following borough courts, how the children who were convicted and sentenced to a fine or imprisonment, and whose numbers in each borough are given below after the name of each borough, were subsequently dealt with, that is to say, how many paid the fine, how many did not pay but were released without being imprisoned after sentence, and how many were actually imprisoned through default of paying the fines or costs: Metropolitan Police Courts, 226; Liverpool, 160; Newcastle-on-Tyne, 138; Sunderland, 115; Bristol, 115; Birkenhead, 104; Sheffield, 91; South Shields, 85; Tynemouth, 73; Gateshead, 64; Nottingham, 54; Birmingham, 46; St. Helens, 46; Middlesbrough, 45; Warrington, 42; West Hartlepool, 38; Leeds, 37; Rotherham, 33; Cardiff, 33; Potteries, Stipendiary Court, 31; Newcastle-under-Lyme, 27; Longton, 26; and whether he will inquire of the borough courts of Manchester, 12; Bradford, 0; West Ham, 3; Hull, 9; Salford, 24; Leicester, 17; and Bolton, 0, what special measures they have adopted to reduce the number of children convicted and fined so far below that of other towns.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) The figures I have obtained in answer to the hon. Member's Question are as follows—

	Number sentenced to fine or imprisonment.			Disposal of persons fined.			
1. Police Court.	2. Total.	3. Imprisonment without option of fine.	4. To pay fines with or without costs.	5. Fines paid.	6. Imprisonment at once in default of payment.	7. Allowed time to pay, but ultimately imprisoned.	8. Other cases, including those outstanding.
Metropolitan Police Courts -	227	3	224	178	46	—	—
Liverpool City -	160	2	158	137	—	—	21
Newcastle-upon-Tyne City -	138	—	138	99	14	16	9
Sunderland Borough - -	115	—	115	114	1	—	—
Bristol City - -	115	—	115	108	—	—	7
Birkenhead Borough - -	59	—	59	53	—	6	—
Sheffield City -	91	—	91	86	1	—	4
South Shields Borough - -	85	—	85	80	—	3	2
Tynemouth Borough - -	73	—	73	69	—	1	3
Gateshead Borough	64	—	64	49	—	—	15
Nottingham City	49	1	48	Not known	—	—	—
Birmingham City	46	1	45	45	—	—	—
St. Helens Borough	46	—	46	46	—	—	—
Middlesbrough Borough - -	45	—	45	38	—	—	7
Warrington Borough - -	42	1	41	41	—	—	—

1. Police Court.	Number sentenced to fine or imprisonment.			Disposal of persons fined.			
	2. Total.	3. Imprisonment without option of fine.	4. To pay fines with or without costs.	5. Fines paid.	6. Imprisonment at once in default of payment.	7. Allowed time to pay, but ultimately imprisoned.	8. Other cases, including those outstanding.
West Hartlepool Borough - -	37	—	37	35	2	—	—
Leeds City - -	37	2	35	32	—	3	—
Rotherham Borough - -	33	—	35	30	—	—	3
Cardiff City - -	32	3	29	15	—	3	11
Staffordshire Potteries Stipendiary District -	31	—	31	26	—	4	1
Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough -	25	—	25	15	—	—	10
Longton Borough -	1	1	†	—	—	—	—
Total - -	1,551	14	1,537	1,296	64	36	93

† In this instance the original return was incorrect, 25 of the 26 cases given in column 6 being dismissed on payment of costs.

Great care must, however, be used in drawing any inferences from these figures. Those relating to imprisonment include cases where defendants are sentenced to imprisonment for one day and are kept in police cells only till the court rises, a practice which is, I believe, very common, especially at the Metropolitan police courts. Again, at some of the courts mentioned above, the number of children sentenced bears a much lower proportion to the total population served by the courts than is the case at some of the courts mentioned in the latter part of the Question. At one court (Leeds), I am told, the only juvenile sent to prison had been three times before the court within the previous six months. At another (Sunderland), the only one sent to prison had previously been seven times before the court and has subsequently been sent to a reformatory school. At a third (Newcastle), all those sent to prison had been previously convicted several times. It would be impossible to give reasons why the number of juveniles convicted at some courts is so much lower than at others. This would depend, not only on the population and character of the district served by the court, but also on the action of the police in bringing juveniles before it, and on the views of the individual magistrates forming the court with regard to the best means of dealing with such cases.

High Sheriffs' Expenses.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL PHILIPPS (Southampton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what allowances are made to the high sheriffs of counties and county boroughs for the expenses connected with elections and the entertainment of Judges and recorders.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) No allowances are made from public funds to the high sheriffs of counties and county boroughs for the expenses connected with elections or for the entertainment of Recorders. Allowances are made to them in respect of the expense incurred by them in providing lodgings for Judges of assizes. When Judges are engaged on the trial of election petitions, allowances are made to the sheriffs for the expense of their accommodation on the scale explained in a Paper of which I will give the hon. and gallant Member a copy.

Fatility on H.M.S. "Hyson."

MR. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the death of a man named Meakin on board the s.s. "Hyson" on 9th April last, by becoming entangled in the machinery of the ship's winch, owing to the place where the man was working being obscured by escaping steam from the cylinders of the winch, and the boy in charge of the winch being inexperienced; if so, if a breach of the dock regulations have been committed, what steps have been taken for such a breach; and what provision is being made to enforce the dock regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) This Question was put to me yesterday by the hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness, and I replied as follows:—I have received a Report with regard to this accident. No breach of Regulation 14, relating to exhaust steam, or of Regulation 16, fixing the age below which persons may be employed as winch drivers, appears to have been committed. The escape of steam that occurred in this case was due apparently to the blowing out of the packing glands. The immediate cause of the accident was the catching of the clothes of the deceased in the shaft of the winch. It has not been the custom, I understand to fence this part of the winch, which has not hitherto been regarded as dangerous, and the inspector states that no accident of the kind has occurred previously during the eighteen months he has been in the district. I am, however, causing inquiry to be made as to whether it would be practicable to do so. I have already stated in reply to Questions in the House the steps which I have taken to strengthen the inspection of docks; in particular, the staff of the Liverpool district, where the accident occurred, has been increased by an additional inspector's assistant.

Liverpool Dock Regulations.

MR. C. DUNCAN (Barrow-in-Furness): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what steps are being taken to enforce the penalties for breaches of the dock regulations in Liverpool in the following cases: s.s. "Lewisham," North King's Dock, exhaust steam obscuring the ship's deck and quay on 26th March; s.s. "Andalusia," South King's Dock, no gangway, on 3rd April; s.s. "Ocean Prince," North King's Dock, exhaust steam, on 22nd April; s.s. "Fridtjof," South King's Dock, exhaust steam, on 22nd April; s.s. "Carmelina," South King's Dock, exhaust steam; which in all cases were so bad as entirely to obscure the decks and hatchways and quays where men were working, discharging and loading cargo; and what measures he intends to take to prevent a recurrence of such breaches of regulations in the future.

(*Answered by Mr Secretary Gladstone.*) The hon. Member's Question appeared on the Paper for the first time this morning, so I have not yet had time to ascertain the facts of the cases to which he refers. When I have done so I will communicate with him further.

Irish Land Purchase—Borrowing Powers.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the provisions of Section 54 of the Irish Land Act of 1903, placing restrictions on the borrowing of money by purchasers on the security of their land; is he aware that these provisions drive borrowers to money lenders at oppressive rates for loans on personal security, and that judgments are then obtained by the money lenders and registered against the lands; that the section does not prevent judgment for any amount being so registered; has his attention been directed to the fact that the section prevents the prudent raising of money for improvement or stocking of the lands; and will he advise that the section should be repealed.

(*Answered by Mr. Cherry.*) I must refer my hon. and learned friend to the Answer given by my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland to an almost identical Question put by him on the 27th of February last.† The section referred to was passed by Parliament with the general assent of all parties, and I do not think that there is any general demand for its repeal. I cannot, therefore, advise the Government to introduce a Bill for the purpose.

Dublin Post Office.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Postmaster-General if he is aware that the proposed structural alterations in the Dublin post office have been temporarily abandoned, and that the present building is totally inadequate for the amount of business to be transacted; and, in view of the fact that every reform asked for by the staff for the past five years has been postponed until the office is rebuilt, can he definitely state when the re-building is to be commenced.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) It is not the case that the proposed structural alterations in the General Post Office in Dublin have been temporarily abandoned. On the contrary a large extension of the building has recently been sanctioned; but some minor points have still to be settled. I hope that the Board of Public Works will shortly be in a position to proceed with the preliminary arrangements for carrying out the work.

Eastern District Office—Casual Sorters.

MR. STEADMAN: To ask the Postmaster-General if the full-time casual sorters are being retained in the Eastern District Office, notwithstanding the notice terminating their engagement expired on 1st April, and that duly qualified officers are waiting for appointments; and, if so, what is the reason for delay in making these appointments.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The hon. Member is mistaken in supposing that notice was given to terminate the engagement on the 1st April of the full-time casual sorters in question. As I informed him, in reply to a Question on the same subject on the 5th ultimo, their employment is temporary, and will cease so soon as the permanent revision now under consideration is sanctioned; but the arrangements in connection with the revision necessarily take time.

Cootehill Postal Arrangements.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General at what hour each day is there a delivery at Dernakesh, Cootehill, national school; and whether it would be possible to have a morning delivery for the convenience of the school and district, the extra cost being so small.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have called for a Report on this subject, and on its receipt I will send the hon. Member a reply.

Luggage Insurance.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will state, for the last five years, the amount paid by passengers by rail for the insurance of personal luggage; the amount of insurance paid on parcels forwarded by railways but not accompanying or belonging to passengers; the amount of claims made against railway companies having termini in London; the amount of compensation paid in settlement of claims, distinguishing those for insured and uninsured passenger luggage; and if he will include this information in the annual Report and Returns made by his Department to Parliament.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The particulars asked for by my hon. friend are not in the possession of the Board of Trade. The question whether it is desirable to obtain this information or any part of it for inclusion in the annual Railway Returns (Capital and Traffic) shall be referred to the Departmental Committee which is now considering the subject of Railway Returns and Accounts.

Trade Statistics—Imports and Exports.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in reference to the tables on imports and exports at the prices of

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxx., 21.

1900 recently issued, and in continuation of a similar Paper of last year, any representations have been received by his Department upon the propriety of using the year 1900, when prices were considerably inflated, as a base year for his calculations; and whether the results would be appreciably affected if any other recent year had been chosen as a base year.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I am not aware of any representations of the nature referred to. The year 1900 is that which was used as a base year for a large number of the calculations with regard to British and Foreign trade and industry contained in the two fiscal volumes and, therefore, seemed most convenient for the purposes of the Return to which the hon. Member alludes. I am advised that the choice of a base year does not appreciably affect the results, and the year 1900 has obvious advantages as a starting point for a new series of statistical data of this kind.

Average Prices.

MR. PIKE PEASE: To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will give the relative average prices of imports and exports compared with the prices of 1900.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The relative average values of import and exports in 1906, as compared with 1900, can be calculated from the table on page 5 of the Return. The results are as follows—

Average values in 1906 expressed as a percentage of the values in 1900:—

Imports - - - - -	103·3
Exports of British produce - -	96·7
Exports of Foreign and Colonial merchandise - - - -	113·8

Target Practice on the South Coast.

MR. SCARISBRICK (Dorsetshire S.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state the amount of injury caused by target practice between Weymouth and St. Alban's Head to the men engaged in the lobster fishery on that part of the South Coast; and whether he will take steps to amend the present conditions.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) A further inquiry is being held to determine the extent of the alleged injury to the lobster fishery in this neighbourhood; but so long as Portland retains its present importance as a naval station the unrestricted use of this area for firing practice is indispensable.

The Landing and Slaughter of Animals in the Channel Islands.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, in view of the fact that a means of increasing and improving the fresh and canned meat supply of the United Kingdom and checking the operations in this country of the Beef Trust of the United States, is prohibited by the action of the Board with regard to the scheme for establishing a foreign animals' wharf and abbatoirs in Alderney, whether he will state what steps he proposes to take.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) I am unable to add anything to the Answer which I gave to my hon. friend the Member for the Cirencester Division on this subject on the 12th ultimo.† The establishment of a wharf at Alderney for the landing and slaughter of animals which are not allowed to be brought to Great Britain on account of the danger of the introduction of disease is open to grave objection, and we are not prepared in any way to countenance the proposal.

SIR WILLIAM BULL: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he will cause an inquiry to be made into the scheme, and a Report drawn up as to the risks of infection of foot-and-mouth disease which have influenced the Board of Agriculture in their action, having regard to the actual dangers which already exist in the Channel Islands, of which the Board takes no notice.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) I see no reason for the institution of any further inquiry into the proposals to which the hon. Member refers. We are under a statutory obligation to prohibit the landing of animals brought from countries in which foot-and-mouth disease exists, and we are not prepared to countenance in any way the reception of such animals in the Channel Islands for slaughter there. The measures taken for the prevention of the introduction of disease into those islands are in some respects even more stringent than our own, and, so long as this is the case, we should not be justified in prohibiting the importation of animals therefrom, subject of course to the safeguards set out in the existing Orders on the subject.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxx., 1432.

Continental Agriculture.

Mr. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he has any statistics showing the proportionate extent of land under crops in France, Germany, and Belgium, as compared with Great Britain and Ireland.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) I presume that by the expression "under crops" my hon. friend means cultivated or farmed land, including permanent pasture. The Returns for the countries named are not strictly comparable owing to differences of classification, and in the case of France and Germany the annual Returns are not complete, and the latest years for which full figures are available are 1892 and 1900, respectively. Moreover the Returns for France and Germany include holdings of all sizes, while those for Belgium exclude holdings of less than one hectare and those for Great Britain exclude holdings of 1 acre or less. Subject to these qualifications the following table gives the information asked for. The area under crops and grass include as far as possible all arable land and all grass land, whether yielding a hay crop or used for grazing stock.

	Great Britain.	Ireland.	Belgium.	France.	Germany.
	1905.	1905.	1904.	1892.	1890.
(1) Total area, acres	56,787,590	20,710,589	7,277,000	130,374,482	133,585,000
(2) Area under crops and grass (including rough grazings) - -	45,049,931	15,262,949	4,322,505	85,758,776	86,586,831
(4) Per cent. - -	79·3	73·7	59·4	65·8	64·8

Customs Watchers Overtime Pay.

Mr. BOWERMAN (Deptford): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, with regard to the rates of overtime pay of Customs watchers, he can say what is the rate of overtime paid to employees in the Post Office, His Majesty's Stationery Office, and other Government Departments in London, who are in receipt of 24s. per week; whether there are any other Government employees in London getting 24s. per week, except the Customs watchers, who are paid at the same rate per hour for overtime as they are paid for their ordinary daily attendance; and whether he will consider the advisability of introducing the rate of 8d. per hour for watchers who are employed at 24s. a week in London, so as to bring the overtime regulations in the Customs Department into line with that of other Government Departments in this respect.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I do not think any useful purpose would be served by a detailed comparison of overtime rates such as the hon. Member suggests. The duties of the watchers are not comparable with those of the other classes referred to. As I stated in reply to the hon. Member on the 12th instant, the question has been considered, and the Board of Customs are unable to recommend an increase of the rate. The

Treasury, having regard to other recent concessions to the watchers, concur in that view.

Civil Service Estimates, Class 3, Vote 14.

Mr. GINNELL (Westmeath N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will supply details of the sum of £7,000 in the Civil Service Estimates, Class 3, Vote 14, Subhead F; and, if not, will he state why details are withheld.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I do not think it would be practicable to give more detail under this sub-head, as it is impossible to say beforehand in what class of cases fees to counsel will be required.

Poor Law Children.

Mr. W. PRIESTLEY (Bradford, E.): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the number of Poor Law children who, on 1st January last, were resident in the workhouses and workhouse infirmaries of London and the provinces respectively; and if he will state in both instances the number who were over three years of age

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) On the 1st January, 1907, the numbers of pauper children relieved in workhouses and workhouse infirmaries in England and Wales were as follows:—

	Number of children chargeable to Poor Law Unions in London.	Number of Children chargeable to Poor Law Unions outside London.	Total.
(a) Not including insane and idiots—			
(1) In workhouses, otherwise than in infirm wards - - -	1,046	13,630	14,67
(2) In infirm wards or infirmaries	2,045	4,645	6,690
(b) Insane and idiots in workhouses† -	14	302	316
	3,105	18,577	21,682

† There were also 132 children chargeable to London unions in district sick asylums, and 797 children in the imbecile asylums belonging to the managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District.

The number of children over three years of age chargeable to Poor Law unions in London in the workhouses on the 5th January last was 446, and in infirmaries, 1,004. Similar information with regard to the rest of England and Wales is not available.

Imports of Plain Spirits.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what was the amount of plain spirit imported during the last twenty years into the United Kingdom on which duty has been paid.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) Statement of the quantities of plain spirits imported into the United Kingdom during the last twenty calendar years, and the quantities on which duty has been paid in each of those years:—

Years.	Imports.	Quantities entered for Home Consumption.		
		Not for Methylation.	For Methylation and for Art or Manufacture on which the differential duty has been paid.	Total.
	Proof Gallons.	Proof Gallons.	Proof Gallons.	Proof Gallons
1887 - - - -	2,340,078	1,397,008	526,456	1,923,464
1888 - - - -	2,956,759	1,576,616	908,717	2,485,333
1889 - - - -	3,199,470	1,732,571	1,023,157	2,755,728
1890 - - - -	2,929,096	1,455,090	1,305,801	2,760,891
1891 - - - -	1,639,895	886,580	656,059	1,542,639
1892 - - - -	1,591,123	824,542	520,227	1,344,769
1893 - - - -	1,727,786	1,131,172	422,693	1,553,865
1894 - - - -	2,028,070	1,168,463	617,704	1,786,167
1895 - - - -	1,517,278	1,278,768	95,402	1,374,170
1896 - - - -	1,329,500	1,292,428	35,879	1,328,307
1897 - - - -	1,367,960	1,268,941	6,514	1,275,455
1898 - - - -	1,015,793	986,406	1,376	987,782
1899 - - - -	1,258,368	1,119,320	8,573	1,127,893
1900 - - - -	1,429,910	1,225,614	61,708	1,287,322
1901 - - - -	2,001,994	1,456,184	380,555	1,836,739
1902 - - - -	3,184,729	1,622,260	1,422,809	3,045,297
For Art or Manufacture	—	—	228	
1903 - - - -	1,907,099	1,476,712	411,949	1,890,425
For Art or Manufacture	—	—	1,764	
1904 - - - -	465,713	417,016	15,145	434,962
For Art or Manufacture	—	—	2,801	
1905 - - - -	239,265	203,176	24	206,777
For Art or Manufacture	—	—	3,577	
1906 - - - -	451,108	383,791	—	387,224
For Art or Manufacture	—	—	3,433	

Longfield Estate, Ballyclough.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners instructed their inspector to visit and report upon the Longfield estate, at Ballyclough, and adjacent district, county Cork; are they aware that Inspector William Small neglected to give notice to or call upon the evicted tenant, Denis Lehane, whose application is before the Commissioners; and what explanation the inspector has to offer in regard to his neglect to visit Lehane's former holding.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inquired last year into the case of Denis Lehane, and were informed by the landlord that the evicted holding now forms part of his demesne, and that he does not propose to sell it. The Commissioners apprised Lehane accordingly, and informed him that his case will be inquired into when they are dealing with the sale of the estate. In the circumstances the Commissioners did not consider it necessary to instruct their inspector to visit the holding.

Geevagh Disturbance.

Mr. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a band belonging to the district of Geevagh, situate near Ballyfarnon, county Sligo, whilst out for practice on St. Patrick's day, was deliberately fired on by a man named Conlon; and that a policeman, who was present, seized the gun, but afterwards gave it up to Conlon, who fired a second shot at the crowd; and, if so, whether the authorities mean to prosecute this man.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed by the police authorities that on the occasion referred to a band and its followers passed near the house of a man named Conlon, hooting and groaning with the apparent object of intimidating him. Conlon's son rushed out with a gun, but did not fire. The gun was taken from him by a policeman. After the band had passed on the policeman returned the gun, and subsequently a shot was fired in the air from Conlon's house, apparently in bravado. The band was a quarter of a mile away at the time. It is not intended to institute a prosecution in the case.

Loughry Manor, Tyrone.

Mr. KETTLE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when, and in what manner, the land and buildings known as Loughry Manor, situated near Cookstown, county Tyrone, were acquired by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction; and what use, if any, has been made of them since they were acquired.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Department of Agriculture received possession of Loughry Manor in the summer of last year, having acquired it by purchase in the superior courts. The property was acquired for the purpose of establishing a school of rural domestic economy for girls in the North of Ireland. The work of adapting the house to the required purpose is now about to be carried out. It was not possible to undertake this work at an earlier date, but it is hoped that the school will be ready to receive pupils next winter.

Belfast Police Inquiry.

Mr. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether at the police inquiry held in the city of Belfast in June 1906, to examine into the conditions of the local force, a Sergeant Kerrigan, an officer of over eighteen years meritorious and unblemished service, testified to the injustice done to Catholic members of the force by the promotion, over their heads, of Protestants whose records did not entitle them to such advancement; whether, in spite of such being the case, his evidence was over-ruled; whether since that time he has been debarred from all promotion by the action he then took, although sergeants several years his junior in rank and service have been promoted, with much less favourable records; and whether he will communicate with the Inspector-General as to the particulars of Kerrigan's case, with a view to a settlement of the claim he makes in regard to the treatment meted out to him because of his being a Catholic.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed by the police authorities that Sergeant Kerrigan's evidence contained a suggestion to the effect mentioned in the first part of the Question, but that the suggestion is quite without foundation. Since the date of the inquiry two sergeants only have been promoted to the rank of head constable in Belfast, and these were senior to Sergeant Kerrigan both as regards service in the force and service in the rank of sergeant. The Inspector-General informs me that neither Sergeant Kerrigan nor any other police witness has been injuriously affected by the evidence which he gave. The sergeant has made neither claim nor complaint to the effect suggested in the last paragraph, and the Inspector-General assures me that the suggestion is entirely unwarranted.

Downpatrick Fairs.

Mr. SLOAN (Belfast, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution passed by the Downpatrick Rural District Council, against Belfast dealers displaying goods for sale on fair days in that town on the pretence that it was done to avoid the spread of spotted fever; and whether, in view of the fact that the Downpatrick Council gave no evidence to support their contention, and the fact that dealers from Belfast have been injured in their business, he will call upon the council to justify their resolution or withdraw it.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Downpatrick Town Commissioners passed a resolution requesting the Downpatrick Rural District Council to take steps to prevent old clothes from being brought for sale into the town. The district council thereupon inquired from the Local Government Board whether they had power to comply with the request, and were informed in reply that the Board were not aware of any enactment giving such power except in the case of infected articles. I have no authority to do what the hon. Member suggests.

Licensing Bill.

Mr. FETHERSTONHAUGH: To ask the Prime Minister if he is yet in a position to state whether the measure of licensing reform, referred to in His Majesty's Speech, will be introduced during the present session; and, if so, is he yet in a position to state approximately when it is intended to introduce it.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) I cannot yet say anything on this question

Sheriff Court Procedure.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask the Prime Minister whether in view of the desire in Scotland for a measure of reform in Sheriff Court procedure, he can now say when it is proposed to move the Second Reading of the Sheriff Court Civil Procedure Bill.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) As soon as possible after the Small Holders' Bill has been sent to the Scottish Committee.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

The Coastguard.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the men who had been employed on the seventy coastguard stations, reported as having been done away with on 21st November, 1906, have been dismissed from the service; and, if so, what men are to fill their places as Reserve for the Royal Navy.

The SECRETARY to the ADMIRALTY (Mr. Edmund Robertson, Dundee): No men have been dismissed from the coastguard service in consequence of the abolition of the stations referred to.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): Then what has happened to the men?

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: They are still in the service.

German Battleships.

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, having regard to the fact that the latest official Return, presented to Parliament last May, described the German battleships ordered as having only eight 11-inch guns as compared with ten

12-inch in the "Dreadnought," and further described the German armoured cruiser as of 14,760 tons displacement, whether the Board have received any authentic information showing an increase in the programme as regards the armament and size of the ships of the German 1906 and 1907 programmes.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Answer is in the negative.

The Mediterranean Fleet.

Mr. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that though the Mediterranean Fleet consists of only six battleships, the newly-appointed Commander-in-Chief, Vice-Admiral Sir Charles Drury, has been given the acting rank of Admiral with corresponding pay and emoluments, and his second-in-command, Rear-Admiral Prince Louis of Battenburg, has been given the acting rank of Vice-Admiral; whether he is aware that, in days when there was no third flag-officer to assist with the cruisers, and the number of battleships was as many as twelve to fourteen, or at least 100 per cent. more, with far greater responsibilities, no such acting rank was given; and whether the Board will explain what efficiency and economy is hoped for from the change.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The arrangements alluded to were approved by the Board on the 6th December, 1904, as part of the scheme by which the seagoing establishment of superior officers was settled for war purposes. The scheme is independent of changes in the allocation and distribution of the strength of the fleets and squadrons, and was in fact introduced concurrently with a reduction in the strength of the Mediterranean Fleet to accord with the political and strategical requirements of the time.

Mr. BELLAIRS: Is it not the case that under the scheme of 1904 the Rear-Admiral remained Rear-Admiral, whereas Prince Louis of Battenburg becomes Vice-Admiral?

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I understand the arrangement was that this should become a Vice-Admiral's appointment.

Indian Legislative Councils.

Mr. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the pledge recently given by the Viceroy of India that no legislation in the direction of widening the powers and responsibilities of the Legislative Councils would be undertaken before the public in India and at home have had ample opportunity for an expression of opinion on the proposals, and in view also of the fact stated by the Viceroy that these proposals are fraught with great possibilities, he will give this House an opportunity of examining and discussing the proposals before any scheme of legislation is finally decided upon.

The SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Morley, Montrose Burghs): If legislation in the Imperial Parliament should prove to be necessary, the Government would follow the ordinary course and would submit their proposals in a Bill or Bills. We should not ask Parliament to accept our measures without full time being given to collect opinion at home and in India.

Arbuthnot and Company's Bankruptcy.

Mr. SMEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that, in connection with the insolvency of Messrs. Arbuthnot and Company, of Madras, a vigilance committee has been set on foot consisting of some of the most prominent citizens; that this vigilance committee have publicly stated in these words that there is an evident desire in high quarters in Madras to screen the offenders from the consequences of their criminal negligence and fraudulent practices; that an expert opinion, unconnected with Madras, has been obtained by the vigilance committee to the effect that the whole report of the auditor discloses an organised fraud from the start; and whether, in view of these facts and of the further fact that the disclosures have, in the words of the committee, rudely shaken the belief of the Indian people in British probity and honour, he will consent to a public inquiry by the Crown into the whole of the circumstances of the insolvency, independently of the proceedings of the local Insolvency Court.

MR. MORLEY: The inquiry in the Insolvency Court, which is presided over by an Indian Judge of the High Court, will afford full opportunities for investigating the allegations referred to in the Question, and, as I have stated before, I see at present no reason to institute a separate inquiry.

Bengal Educational Staff.

MR. McCALLUM (Paisley): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he will state the number of members of the Indian Educational Service in Bengal as it stood in 1900 and 1906, and the proportion of Indians to Europeans in both cases.

MR. MORLEY: The number of members of the Indian Educational Service in Bengal on 1st January, 1900, was twenty-six, of whom four were natives of India; on 1st January, 1906, the number was thirty-two, of whom four were natives of India.

MR. McCALLUM: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India how many appointments have been made to the Indian Educational Service in Bengal during the last five years; how many of the gentlemen so appointed have been of Indian nationality; how many of them are now filling offices which, five years ago, were filled by Indian members of the Education Department; and how many are holding newly-created posts.

MR. MORLEY: Since January, 1902, eight appointments (including one for temporary work) have been made to the Indian Educational Service in Bengal. None of the gentlemen appointed were natives of India. One post held by a native of India in 1902 has ceased to be so held owing to the retirement of the incumbent. The vacancy has been filled by the appointment of a European, who, however, is employed on different duties. Three of the officers enumerated hold posts created since 1902. I would remind the hon. Member of the very full Answer that I gave him last Thursday,† to which I may add that three appointments to be held by Indians were created last year in the Provincial service in Bengal.

Indian Railway Board.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether it is proposed to appoint any native of India to sit on the Committee of Inquiry into the system under which the Indian Railway Board now works, and other matters connected with the working of railways in India; and, if not, whether, in view of the interest of the people of India in the efficient and economic administration of the railways constructed in their country, he will reconsider his decision in this matter.

MR. MORLEY: I fully recognise the interest of Indians in the economical and efficient administration of the railways which are of unique importance to all classes of the community. But the scope of the inquiry calls rather for expert and intimate knowledge of the direction of railway companies and the conditions and methods of the money market, and this is amply afforded by the gentlemen who have consented to serve. I have no doubt whatever that the Committee will take every opportunity of consulting representative Indian opinion.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Is it not the fact that the capital with which these railways were built was sent out from England?

MR. MORLEY: Some may have been.

Calcutta Improvements.

MR. C. E. PRICE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India what is the present position of the scheme for the improvement of Calcutta; whether the Committee which has been lately discussing the question in Calcutta was entirely composed of members of the Indian Civil Service and held its meetings in private; and, if so, whether, seeing that the bulk of the cost will have to be met by the residents of the city, it is intended to permit them to have an opportunity of expressing their views before the scheme is finally sanctioned.

MR. MORLEY: I understand that the opinions of the Calcutta Corporation and other local bodies on the provisional improvement scheme are under the consideration of the Government of Bengal.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii, 1125.

I have seen a statement in the Calcutta papers that in February last the Lieutenant-Governor convened an informal conference to consider the subject, in which the Government of India, the Bengal Government, the Corporation of Calcutta, and the mercantile community were represented. I have no knowledge of any other Committee. I cannot say at this stage what steps will be taken to consult the public on the conclusions which may be finally arrived at by the Government of Bengal, but public criticism of the provisional scheme was invited in 1905.

Australia—Old Age Pensions and Expenditure on Defence.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the estimate by the recent Australian Royal Commission on Old Age Pensions that the annual cost to the Commonwealth of a general system of old age pensions would be £1,500,000; what is the sum now expended annually by the Commonwealth on military and naval defence; and what would that sum be if the inhabitants of Australia bore the same burden per head for their own defence, and for the defence of the Empire, as is borne by the inhabitants of the United Kingdom.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): I have seen the estimate referred to. The expenditure in Australia on military and naval defence is rather over £1,000,000 a year, and would be about £6,000,000 if the payment per head of the population were the same as in this country.

Colonial Conference and Preferential Trading.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will issue to the public the memoranda on preferential trading which are to be submitted to the Colonial Conference; and, if so, when.

MR. CHURCHILL: Perhaps I may be allowed to answer this Question. As has been stated already the question of publication of the proceedings of the Colonial Conference and of the papers laid before it is one for consideration by the Conference itself, and no final decision has yet been taken.

MR. LYTTELTON (St. George's, Hanover Square): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman, whom I beg to congratulate on receiving his Privy Councillorship, whether it would be convenient that at the end of each week's proceedings the summary which the Conference has decided to publish should be issued to this House with the Votes?

MR. CHURCHILL: A *verbatim* record is being kept of everything that passes at the Council, and it will be for the Conference itself to decide whether that record shall be published. It seems very probable that the Conference will decide that it shall be published. Meanwhile daily summaries are published in a shorter form. If the right hon. Gentleman suggests that these summaries should be issued weekly with the Votes in a compendious form instead of in the form in which they are issued to the newspapers, I should like to bring that desire to the notice of the Secretary of State, who, I have no doubt, will wish to give effect to it.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) asked if the decision concerning the publication of the summaries was come to by vote.

MR. CHURCHILL said the proposal was arrived at unanimously—without the necessity for a vote.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government object to the proceedings and debates in the present Colonial Conference on the question of Imperial preferential trade being freely reported day by day for the use of the Press, so that the people of the Empire may know as much about them as they do about the important questions which are debated in the House of Commons.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): My right hon. friend the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies had, I thought, sufficiently answered this Question. As I informed the hon. Member on Monday, it is entirely for the Conference itself to decide how far it will give publicity to its proceedings. This applies to the entire range of questions discussed, and therefore includes the question of preferential trade.

MR. HUNT: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman to answer the Question: Does he or does he not object to having the debates fully reported?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have already said it is entirely in the hand of the Conference.

MR. HUNT: I press for an Answer. I have had no Answer yet.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It would be indecent for me to say whether we objected or not, when it is in the hands of the Conference, and we wish to leave them free.

Macedonia.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any Reports have been received from the inspectors of the Macedonian Financial Commission upon the condition of the villages and towns in the interior; and, if so, whether he will include such Reports when papers are laid upon the subject.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): It is hoped to lay papers very soon dealing with the condition of the Macedonian Vilayets. These papers will include despatches from Mr. Harvey, the British Delegate on the Financial Commission, as well as from His Majesty's Consular Agents.

Turkish Customs Duties.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he is able to state what is the present position of the negotiations with respect to the proposed increase of the Turkish Customs duties.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The Protocol by which the assent of the Powers to the 3 per cent. increase is to be conveyed was to have been signed on Monday last, but the signature has been postponed in consequence of a difficulty which has arisen in connection with the execution of the new Customs regulations.

The Bahr-el-Ghazal.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will state the date upon which the Congolese troops evacuated the Soudanese Bahr-el-Ghazal, in accordance with the terms of the Anglo-Belgian Convention.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Instructions were sent by the Congo Government to the Commandant at Lado on 8th April, to evacuate all Congolese posts in the Bahr-el-Ghazal. I am not aware whether these instructions have yet been fully carried out.

MR. LONSDALE: Can the right hon. Gentleman state the date on which the Convention was entered into, and the reason for the delay?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have given the date at least once, and have explained that the actual date of evacuation must depend to a great extent on the season of the year and climatic conditions.

Canadian Tariffs.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, in the event of a treaty being concluded between Canada and a foreign country bringing into operation the Canadian intermediate tariff in regard to that country, it would be a contravention of such treaty to lower the preferential tariff in the absence of any stipulation providing for the freedom of action of Canada in respect of such tariff.

SIR EDWARD GREY: As I informed the hon. Member on the 18th instant, the grant of the intermediate tariff to any foreign country would not prevent the Canadian Government from altering the British preferential tariff in the future.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what are the proper channels for negotiations between Canada and Foreign Powers; and whether anyone is, at present, entrusted with plenipotentiary or other powers to conduct, on behalf of Canada, direct negotiations with such foreign countries.

Sir EDWARD GREY: The proper channels for negotiations between Canada and Foreign Powers are His Majesty's Diplomatic Representatives abroad, instructed by His Majesty's Government, who may associate with them any agent selected by the Canadian Government, should that Government desire it. The answer to the second part of the question is that no special powers or instructions of the kind suggested have been issued, but His Majesty's Representative at Washington has for some time been engaged in the discussion of outstanding questions with the United States Government.

Mesopotamia Oil Concession.

Mr. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has now received any reply to the inquiry which he has addressed to His Majesty's Embassy at Constantinople with reference to the concession of the oil deposits in Mesopotamia granted by the Turkish Government on the 4th–17th July, 1904, to Mr. K. Zander, as representing the German financial group interested in the proposed Baghdad Railway; and whether this concession is still in force.

Sir EDWARD GREY: There is no information available to the effect that the contract to which the hon. Member refers is still in force.

Mr. BOWLES: Has any reply been received to the inquiry?

Sir EDWARD GREY: Yes. I have given the reply.

Registered Companies in the United States.

Mr. VIVIAN (Birkenhead): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can state the number of companies registered in the United States for the year 1906, and the amount of their nominal capital.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I have no information on the subject, but I will ascertain whether it is available.

Persia and Germany.

Mr. BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information from the British Minister at Teheran showing that a close working arrangement has recently been established through the activity of the German Minister at Teheran between the German Orient Bank of Berlin and the National Bank of Persia in Teheran.

Sir EDWARD GREY: Reports as to German assistance in the establishment of a National Bank have reached His Majesty's Minister at Teheran, but they have so far not been confirmed.

Egypt.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a number of officials have been dismissed, or invited to resign, from the service of the Egyptian Government for no reason of misconduct, but solely on account of their differing from the British Agency on points of administration; and whether he has sanctioned such proceedings.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I am not aware of any such circumstances.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would make inquiries as to whether such cases had occurred.

Sir EDWARD GREY: The Question of the hon. Gentleman seems to imply a general censure on appointments and dismissals in the Egyptian service. I have no reason to suppose that such a Question is justified, and there is no reason for me to make inquiries.

The Soudan.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Christian missions in the southern portion of the Soudan are being actively promoted by the Government there, notwithstanding that the population of the northern portion of that province is declared by Lord Cromer to be almost entirely Moslem, and that Christian propaganda is there expressly forbidden, excepting in Khartoum;

whether, in view of the danger of this artificial division of the Soudan into two contrasted portions, and in order to obviate the risks of sanguinary conflict amongst a people just emerging from barbarism, he will direct that the official promotion of Christian missions in the Southern Soudan shall cease.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information beyond that contained in Chapters 6, 43, and 56 of Lord Cromer's Annual Report for 1906, and in previous Reports which have been published. And I am not aware of any circumstances which require such intervention as the hon. Member suggests.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: The right hon. Gentleman has not directly answered the last paragraph of my Question.

SIR EDWARD GREY replied that the Government of the Soudan were perfectly aware of the danger which was referred to in Lord Cromer's Report and there was therefore no reason for further inquiry.

Syrians in the Egyptian Civil Service.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what is the total number of Syrians in the Civil Service of the Egyptian and the Soudan Governments respectively; and what proportion their average salary bears to the average salary of Egyptians employed by those Governments.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no information as to the number of Syrians who may be employed in the Civil Services of Egypt and the Soudan, nor as to their salaries.

Egyptian Civil Service—Board of Selection.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state what are the names and qualifications of the members of the board, described by Lord Cromer in his Report for 1904, page 61, as making the selection of candidates for the Egyptian Civil Service; by whom they were nominated; for what period of time, and at what salary; how often, since its constitution, the board has met; what are the names of the candidates who have been selected by the board; and what are the posts to which they have been appointed.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I will inquire what the present composition of the board is, and I will ask for as much of the other information as is easily obtainable.

Great Britain and Russia and Persia.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what is the present state of the negotiations between Great Britain and Russia with respect to their respective spheres of influence in Persia; and whether there is any prospect of an immediate agreement being arrived at.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I am not in a position to make any statement as to the nature of any negotiations respecting Persia.

Hague Conference—British Government.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is able, in view of the interest in the subject and the perplexity caused by conflicting public statements, to indicate what will be the initial attitude of the Government at the forthcoming Hague Conference towards the proposed limitation of armaments.

SIR EDWARD GREY: The instructions to be given to the British Plenipotentiaries are at present under consideration. I am unable to make any statement on the subject, and in view of the fact that the wishes and intentions of other Governments have to be considered, it is possible that any further statement of the proposals of one Government would give rise to the perplexity which my hon. friend deprecates.

Freedom of the Press in Egypt.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if his attention has been called to the language used by certain of the newspapers in Egypt in their references to the authorities and the Government; and whether, having regard to the condition of affairs there, he will consider the advisability of modifying the freedom of the Press, to the advantage of Egypt and its Government.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I must refer the hon. Member to Chapter 4 of Lord Cromer's Annual Report for 1906, where he will find a much fuller statement than can be conveyed in an Answer to a Question. It is not proposed to alter the policy there advocated.

Old Age Pensions.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the unanimous recommendation of the Australian Royal Commission upon Old Age Pensions, to the effect that a penalty should be imposed for supplying an old age pensioner with intoxicating drink; and whether His Majesty's Ministers have yet considered any plan for dealing with the danger indicated by this recommendation.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER (Mr. Asquith, Fifeshire, E.): In dealing with the question of old age pensions no relevant consideration will be left out of account.

*Mr. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) asked if the right hon. Gentleman would consider the desirability of conferring local veto powers on the people so that zones of safety might be provided for the pensioners described in the Question.

[No Answer was returned.]

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he has made any calculations as to the number of persons of the industrial classes who would benefit under an old age pensions scheme which was started on a nucleus of £2,250,000.

Mr. ASQUITH: I have not thought it necessary to make any such calculations.

Mr. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his attention has been called to the evidence given before the Australian Royal Commission on Old Age Pensions to the effect that in Victoria old age pensions have in no way diminished the expenditure upon the charitable relief of the poor, and that in New South Wales, according to the evidence of the Controller of the Charities Department and other witnesses, there has been an actual increase in the number of applicants for charitable relief through the passing of the Old Age Pensions Act; and whether he will take steps to ascertain what has been the effect of the German system of old age pensions upon the cost of the Poor Law relief in the principal cities of the German Empire.

Mr. ASQUITH: My attention has been called to the evidence in question; but I also note that in their Report the Commission stated that it was not to be expected that, so soon after the establishment of a system of old age pensions, any marked change in the expenditure on other forms of relief would be apparent. I have no figures relating to the comparative cost of Poor Law relief in Germany, nor do I think that, if obtained, any very useful lesson could be drawn from them, regard being had to the peculiar scope of the German insurance law and the practical exclusion from its operations of the majority of women.

Mr. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): Can the right hon. Gentleman inform the House as to the position of friendly societies in Germany and how they have been affected by old age pensions?

Mr. ASQUITH: No, Sir, I cannot.

Income-Tax.

Mr. FELL: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if, on his rearrangement of the incidence of the income-tax, he will provide that limited companies shall be required to pay income-tax only on the dividends they actually pay to their shareholders, and not on an estimate of profits arbitrarily arrived at by the Commissioners, and which profits are rarely available for distribution among the shareholders.

Mr. ASQUITH: The hon. Member's suggestion has often been considered, but neither my predecessors nor I myself have ever seen any sufficient reason for altering the law for the assessment of limited companies to income-tax upon their profits as determined by the rules of the Income-Tax Acts, in the same way as other taxpayers.

Mr. FELL: Is it not the fact that a considerable number of shareholders have to pay tax on an income they never receive?

Mr. ASQUITH: I do not know that they do.

Privileged Cabs.

Sir SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his negotiations with the railway companies with respect to the recommendations of the Select Committee on Cabs and Omnibuses, which sat last session, on the question of the privilege-cab system, have failed; and, if so, whether he will introduce legislation at an early date to give effect to those recommendations.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Gladstone, Leeds, W.): As I said in a written Answer which I gave to the hon. Member for the Droitwich division of Worcestershire on the 18th instant, I am still in communication with the railway companies, and still have hopes of obtaining the desired result by friendly arrangement. Owing to the number and different characteristics of the different stations affected the Question is far from simple, but I am pressing forward my negotiations, and I have not relaxed in any way my declared intention of dealing with the matter.

Mines (Eight Hours) Bill.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for the City of London, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the statement of the Standing Committee on Trade that they were unable to discuss the Mines (Eight Hours) Bill for lack of information, he intends to recommit the Bill when the necessary information is obtained.

Mr. GLADSTONE: No, Sir. When the Committee over which my hon. friend the Member for Gloucester presides, have presented their Report, the Government intend to introduce a Bill of their own.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the fact that there is no precedent for the action of the Grand Committee on Trade in declining to consider a Bill remitted to it by this House, and that only thirty-four out of the eighty-three Members of the Committee were present, when, by a majority of four, the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill was thus summarily dealt with, and that it was on the recommendation of the Prime Minister that the Bill was referred upstairs, he will afford facilities for recommitting it to one of the Grand Committees.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I must refer my hon. friend to the speech of the Prime Minister on 12th April, to the effect that, having regard to the new Standing Order which he was asking the House to adopt, he did not see how an exception in the case of the Mines (Eight Hours) Bill could be made to the general rule which was about to come into force. The Standing Committee having reported the Bill to the House without Amendment on the ground that the information at their disposal was inadequate to enable Amendments to be satisfactorily discussed, the Government cannot give facilities for its recommitment.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) asked if it was customary for Members co-opted to a Standing Committee to be informed on Saturday that they were expected to attend the meeting of the Committee on Monday. That happened to a number of Members on this occasion. He also asked if the Bill would be recommitted.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I am afraid I have nothing to do with the summoning of Members, and I cannot, therefore, answer the Question.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: Will Mr. Speaker inform me?

*Mr. SPEAKER said he was equally unable to give the information, but he would inquire of the Chairman of the Committees of Selection as to the practice in giving notice.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS: When the House refers a Bill to a Committee, is not that a mandatory instruction to the Committee to consider that Bill? Is it competent for the Committee to return the Bill without considering it ?

*Mr. SPEAKER : I think it is a practice which ought to be carefully watched, because great difficulties, indeed abuses, may arise from a majority on a Committee treating a Bill in that particular way without reason for doing so. There are certain precedents for the manner in which the Standing Committee dealt with this particular Bill. Standing Committees are instructed by the Standing Orders to follow the procedure of Select Committees, and as these have so dealt with Bills, the Standing Committee is justified in the action taken; but it is a practice that ought to be very carefully watched.

Mr. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: In view of what did happen, is it the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to reduce the hours of labour in mines—not to regulate but to reduce the hours—that it may become law this session ?

*Mr. SPEAKER : I think the hon. Member ought to give notice of the Question.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) asked whether, under the Standing Order establishing the new Standing Committees, it would be open to anybody to make such a Motion ?

*Mr. SPEAKER : The new Committees are governed by the Standing Orders.

Mr. W. E. HARVEY (Derbyshire, N.E.) asked whether want of due notice in summoning Members was not sufficient reason for recommiting the Bill.

Mr. GLADSTONE said he was not aware the ordinary course was not followed.

Mr. W. E. HARVEY pressed for something more direct, but no further Answer was given.

Mr. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) : I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the action of the Home Secretary immediately on the commencement of business in the Standing Committee on Trade last Monday, 22nd April, in moving to report the Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, without Amendment, to the House, with a statement that the Committee had insufficient evidence on which to consider it, is to become a recognised Government precedent for postponing private Members' Bills.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN : No, Sir; every case will be judged on its own merits.

Mr. D. A. THOMAS : Is it not the case that the Government in 1894 gave facilities for an Eight Hours Bill in Committee of the Whole House ? Can the right hon. Gentleman state what information he was then seized of which he has not now ?

Sir. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN : I cannot say.

Mr. EVELYN CECIL : Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the ruling of Mr. Speaker that this procedure needs to be carefully watched ?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN : If I may venture to say so, I entirely share the view expressed by Mr. Speaker.

The Edalji Inquiry.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) : I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can say when the Report of the Edalji Commission will be concluded and presented.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Sir Arthur Wilson and his colleagues have just presented me with their Report, and I shall at once consider it.

Schools of Agriculture.

Mr. ASHLEY : I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education how many technical classes in agriculture and schools of agriculture are assisted by the Board of Education out of public funds; and how many of such schools and classes are inspected by the Board of Education.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of EDUCATION (Mr. McKenna, Monmouthshire, N.) : There are two main categories of schools to be considered—(a) those intended for the instruction of persons already in employment connected with agriculture or horticulture, and unable to give more than a portion of their time to study; and (b) those intended for the instruction of persons who are still giving the whole of their time, or a large portion of it, to study. (a) Of the former category there are 275 separate schools recognised by the Board as eligible for grant, in which there are 368 classes in agriculture or subjects related thereto or to other rural industries, *e.g.* in horticulture, in land surveying, in dairying, in farm work, and so forth—forty-eight of these classes being classes dealing specifically with "agriculture." These numbers do not include classes in such subjects attended not only by those who take them with a view to their bearing upon agriculture, but by other students also. (b) In the second category there are nine schools providing courses in agriculture, horticulture, and dairying. All the schools I have referred to are under inspection by the Board of Education, and are in England and Wales, not Scotland, which is not under this Board. The figures from which the above totals have been compiled are not complete in the case of those counties which have taken advantage of the new scheme of inclusive grants introduced last year into the Board's Regulations with the object of meeting the special conditions of instruction in the subjects which are found most suitable for rural areas.

Cost of School Maintenance in Glamorganshire.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the cost of school maintenance per child in Glamorganshire for the year ending 30th November last, based on the average attendance, was 16s. 9d., or 38 per cent. higher in the provided than in the non-provided schools; and whether this excess is due to unnecessary expenditure on the part of the local education authority or to a higher standard of efficiency being required by the Education Department in the case of provided schools.

MR. McKENNA: My attention has not previously been called to the statistics given in the first part of my hon. friend's Question. It is not, I am glad to say, one of the duties of the Board of Education to ascertain the reasons why the cost of maintenance of certain schools is greater than that of others.

LORD R. CECIL asked if it were not the practice of local education authorities in South Wales consistently to underpay their teachers?

MR. McKENNA asked for notice of the Question.

Glamorganshire Education Rate.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether he is aware that, in the estimate of receipts and expenditure during the financial year ending 31st March, 1908, for the administrative county of Glamorgan £69,000 is to be provided out of a rate of 1s. 2d. in the pound for the maintenance of provided schools, while nothing is proposed to be contributed out of rates for the maintenance of non-provided schools; whether this discrimination between the two classes of schools has received his sanction, and if the same standard of efficiency will be required by the Education Department in the case of each class.

MR. McKENNA: So long as the local education authority perform their statutory duty of maintaining and keeping efficient the public elementary schools in their area, the expenditure incurred by the authority on individual schools is not subject to review by the Board of Education and does not require their sanction. The standard of efficiency requisite to earn the grant is the same for council schools and voluntary schools.

British Mail Van Drivers.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that the mail van drivers in Bristol work on an average fourteen and three-quarter hours per day for six days of the week and six to eleven hours on Sundays, and receive in wages only 21s. per week, with no pay for overtime; and whether, in view of the nature of the service, inquiries will be instituted with a view to giving the Bristol mail van drivers similar improvements in their terms of service to those granted to the metropolitan drivers.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I will make inquiry on this subject, and will aquaint the hon. Member with the result.

Canadian Tariffs.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state what is the average rate of duty on British exports under the general, preferential, and intermediate tariffs respectively of Canada.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport): The British preferential rates are on the average about 30 per cent. lower and the intermediate rates about 10 per cent. lower than the general rates of duty under the Canadian tariff. The Board of Trade are not, however, in a position to give an exact figure showing what would be the average rate of duty on British exports if they were subjected to the general, preferential, and intermediate tariffs respectively.

MR. PIKE PEASE: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the average rate given to foreign countries is in the Blue Book?

MR. KEARLEY: Yes, but the tariff has changed since then.

Arbroath Disaster—Treating Railway Employees.

MR. LEIF JONES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been drawn to the comments of Major Pringle in his Report on the Arbroath railway accident, on the well-meant but ill-advised action of the general public in treating railway men with intoxicants; and whether he can see his way to put an end to this practice by inducing the railway companies to establish the rule that railway servants on duty shall not be served with intoxicants in railway refreshment rooms. (The hon. Member explained that the words "well-meant but ill-advised" were a quotation from Major Pringle's report and not his own.)

MR. KEARLEY: Yes, I know that. I understand that the railway companies generally have made a rule to the effect suggested. It does not appear from Major Pringle's report that Gourlay was served with intoxicants in the railway refreshment room.

*MR. LEIF JONES: Then do I understand that there is such a rule in existence on many of our railways?

MR. KEARLEY: Yes.

MR. LEIF JONES: Then it is very much violated.

MR. C. E. PRICE: Is there any law under which the public can be prosecuted for giving intoxicants in such cases?

MR. KEARLEY: I should like notice of that Question.

Brakes for Street Cars.

MR. BELL (Derby); I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will use his influence with the Tramways and Light Railways Association and the Municipal Tramways Association to meet jointly, so as to be assisted by a representative of the Board of Trade, to inquire into the question of brake-power on street cars.

MR. KEARLEY: I understand that the two Associations will in due course meet and compare the results arrived at by their respective committees, which are now carrying on independent investigations. The Board of Trade will be prepared to appoint a representative to assist them.

Technical Classes in Agriculture.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the hon- Member for South Somerset as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture whether a Departmental Committee of the Board of Agriculture has been appointed to report on the provision of technical classes in agriculture; whether any representative of the Board of Education has been appointed to that Committee; and, if not, why no such representative hasbeen appointed.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): The Committee to which the hon. Member refers was appointed "to inquire as to the provision which has now been made for affording scientific and technical instruction in agriculture in England and Wales and to report whether, in view of the practical results which have already been obtained, the existing facilities for the purpose are satisfactory and sufficient, and, if not, in what manner they may with advantage be modified or extended." It has quite been the hope of my noble friend that a representative or representatives of the Board of Education would be included in the Committee, but he has not hitherto been able to make arrangements for the purpose. He proposes, however, further to confer with my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Education on the subject.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, how many technical classes in agriculture and schools of agriculture are assisted by the Board of Argiculture; and how many such schools and classes are inspected by the Board of Agriculture?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The number of institutions which received grants from the Board for the purposes of agricultural education in 1906–7 was twenty. All of them were inspected and reported upon in the course of the year. In addition our inspectors keep in close touch with the work of county councils in connection with agricultural education and visit and report upon the classes and lectures held under their auspices.

National Physical Laboratory.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in the event of the Committee appointed to inquire into the work now performed at the National Physical Laboratory asking for evidence from persons who either personally or as spokesmen of an institution object to giving evidence before the Committee on the ground that they distrust its impartiality, he will give such persons opportunity to lay their views before the Treasury before any action based on the report of Committee is taken by the Treasury.

MR. RUNCIMAN: No, Sir.

MR. NIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether it is competent under the present terms of reference for the Treasury Committee, appointed to consider the conduct of the National Physical Laboratory, to report in favour of a reconstitution of the executive committee of the National Physical Laboratory, in order that it may include representatives of bodies now unrepresented, such as the Institute of Chemistry, the Institution of Gas Engineers, and the Surveyors' Institute, and also representative independent consultants; and that the professional bodies now represented, such as the Institution of Civil Engineers, the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, and the Iron and Steel Institute, shall have a larger representation than at present; and, in the event of it not being competent under the present terms of reference to recommend these alterations, whether he is prepared to amend the terms of reference so as to include them in the scope of the Committee's labours.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Evidence on such questions has, I understand, been already taken by the Committee; and any recommendations which they may see fit to make for changing representation so as to advance the work of the Laboratory will receive consideration by the Treasury.

Saturday Half-Holidays for Government Employees.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that a regular weekly Saturday half-holiday is granted in many large Government departments to the members of the clerical staffs; is this privilege granted at the discretion of the heads of these departments; whether it is within the discretion of the head of any Government department to extend this privilege to the members of his staff, provided that the state of public business permits; and, if so, will he take steps to have the heads of those departments in which the privilege is restricted to alternate Saturdays made aware of the extent of their discretion in the matter.

MR. RUNCIMAN: No sanction has been given by the Treasury for a regular weekly half-holiday. But the circumstances of particular offices and of individual cases vary so much that I cannot make any general statement as to the conditions under which half-holidays are or may be granted.

Mr. G. A. HARDY (Suffolk, Stowmarket): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in all offices of the Civil Service, clerks who are required to work overtime must, in order to obtain full payments, forego the usual Saturday half-holiday; whether there are any exceptions to this rule, and, if so, what are the grounds on which such exceptions are made.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: By the terms of the Orders in Council regulating the Civil Service a half-holiday on alternate Saturdays can only be granted if the state of public business permits. If the state of public business is such as to require the clerks to work overtime, it is clear that this condition is not fulfilled.

British Museum Reading Room.

Mr. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the contract for redecorating the reading room of the British Museum was put out to public tender; and, if not, will he say why this course was not adopted.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: Six firms were asked to compete. Public tendering would have been impossible in this case, as an unlimited number of people could not have been allowed access to the reading room when it was in use by the public to take the measurements and particulars necessary to enable them to frame a tender.

Mr. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): I should like to ask the hon. Gentleman if some of the officials of the British Museum could not have got out bills of quantities and supplied them to the contractors.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The officials of the Museum are not provided with a staff capable of doing such work.

Mr. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): Why could not the firms have sent their own employees to take out the specifications when the reading room was closed?

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I cannot say.

Law of Newspaper Libel.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General whether his attention has been called to recent cases in which, in the course of judicial proceedings, charges have been made against absent persons not parties to such proceedings; and whether he will consider the desirability of introducing legislation to amend the present law of libel, by annulling the plea of privilege at present protecting the authors and publishers of such charges.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Sir John Walton, Leeds, S.): I see great difficulty in limiting the privilege now existing which protects from actions, witnesses and others concerned in the conduct of judicial trials who make statements in court which cast reflection upon absent persons who are not parties to the cause. It would also be difficult to prevent the publication of these statements whenever they form part of a fair and accurate report of the proceedings, although I think that individuals often suffer seriously owing to charges against them being unnecessarily made and thoughtlessly repeated in the public press. The hon. Member has in particular good cause to complain of an incident of this kind to which he has drawn my attention.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY: May I ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he will consider the desirability of representing to the proper Government Department the importance of advising coroners who hold inquests on suicides not to give publicity to letters written by demented persons before committing suicide, casting aspersions on living persons who have no opportunity of repudiating them?

Sir JOHN WALTON: Coroners must be well aware of the desirability of exercising caution in that matter, and the Press who report these inquests must also be conscious of their duty in the matter.

Dog Poisoning in Sutherlandshire.

*Mr. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been drawn to the poisoning of the crofters' dogs in the neighbourhood of Badininish, Skelbo, Sutherland; whether he is aware that a dog is absolutely necessary to the crofter; will he take steps to put an end to this persecution of crofters: and is he aware that putting poison about may be a danger to human beings as well as animals.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea, for Mr. SINCLAIR): My right hon. friend desires me to say that his attention has not been drawn to the matter referred to by the hon. Member. He will be glad to make inquiries.

Scottish Electoral List.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether, having regard to the proposals of the Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, he can say what is the estimated proportion of parish electors in an area to the total inhabitants of the area; and whether he can furnish any statistics showing the average proportion of those on the register who have in fact voted in local elections in Scotland to which this register applies.

MR. JOHN BURNS (for Mr. SINCLAIR): The only return of parish electors available is for the year 1898, when for the whole of Scotland it was 787,629, or nearly a sixth of the population. My right hon. friend has no information as to the number voting.

Irish University Scheme.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will communicate to the House a full list of the protests which he has received from Universities and colleges in the United Kingdom against proceeding with the Irish University scheme upon the lines laid down by the late Chief Secretary.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): I have received protests from the Senate of the University of Dublin, resident members of the University of Oxford, principals and professors of the Scottish Universities, of the University of Sheffield, the constituent colleges of the University of Wales, and of St. David's College, Lampeter, and from lecturers in the school of medicine of the Royal Colleges, Edinburgh. So far as English and Scottish University opinion was expressed in these protests, it was mainly confined to that part of the proposal which related to a federated University.

*MR. KETTLE (Tyrone E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman give a list of the Irish educational associations and elective bodies which have given cordial support to the scheme outlined by Mr. Bryce?

MR. BIRRELL: It could be given, but I do not know of any advantage that accrues to one side or the other by the publication of these things.

Keogh Estate, Sligo.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the tenantry on the Keogh estate, situate in Geevagh parish, county Sligo, have repeatedly appealed to the landlord, who resides in Dublin, to enter into an agreement with them for the purchase of their holdings, which appeals he has refused to entertain; and that many of these tenants or their predecessors have been evicted from holdings on the same estate, all of which have been consolidated into a grazing ranche which the landlord lets on the eleven months' system; and whether, as these tenants occupy uneconomic holdings which are rackrented, the Estates Commissioners will be instructed to negotiate with Mr. Keogh for the purchase of this estate.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners cannot trace any proceedings in regard to this estate as having been instituted before them, and they have no knowledge of the facts alleged in the Question. If the name and address of the owner should be communicated to them, they would make inquiries into the matter.

Case of Thomas Gaffney of Gawran.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will inquire into the reason of the manner in which Thomas Gaffney, of Gawran, county Kilkenny, was treated by the police on the night of the 3rd February last, when being arrested for alleged drunkenness and assault; whether he is aware that Gaffney was confined in the lock-up all night, and summarily dealt with early next morning by two local magistrates, Messrs. White and Byrne, who refused his request for an adjournment to summon witnesses as to his sobriety and to obtain legal aid; whether he is aware that, prior to Gaffney being so dealt with, the senior magistrate of the district, Joseph Walsh, esquire, chairman county council, had stated his opinion that Gaffney's offence was too trivial for summary treatment, and had instructed the police to summon Gaffney to petty sessions; and what explanation the police authorities have to offer for ignoring this instruction, and for having Gaffney tried summarily in the absence of his witnesses and solicitor.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am informed by the police authorities that the man referred to, who is a tramp, was arrested at nine o'clock at night for drunkenness and disorderly conduct, and that after arrest he assaulted a sergeant by kicking and biting him, and also assaulted a constable. As the man had no fixed place of abode, it was not considered desirable to liberate him with the view of summoning him to petty sessions. He was detained in custody that night, and was summarily dealt with by two local justices on the following morning. He admitted the offences, and made no request for adjournment and said nothing about witnesses or legal aid. Mr. Walsh was in no way concerned in the case, and gave no instructions whatever to the police.

Mr. MEAGHER asked whence the right hon. Gentleman got his information. Was he aware that this tramp was born in the district, and that the county of Kilkenny was more free from crime than any other county, and why was this man to be thus summarily treated for a trivial offence?

Mr. BIRRELL replied that under the criminal law summary treatment was usually meted out for trivial offences. The man, wherever he was born, was a tramp.

Mr. MEAGHER: But did the right hon. Gentleman seek information from any person other than those directly concerned?

Mr. BIRRELL: It is difficult in asking about a tramp to get information from anyone except the police, but if the hon. Member has anything more to tell me about this tramp I shall be willing to hear it.

Mr. ASHLEY: Is biting a police sergeant a trivial offence?

Mr. BIRRELL: I do not consider it so except in my capacity as a lawyer.

Land Purchase in County Cork.

Mr. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether in December last the agents to the O'Donovan, Bird, and Browne estates, situate in the parish of Kilcrohane, county Cork, made offers of sale to the Congested Districts Board; will he say whether the Congested Districts Board have since made offers of purchase; and, if not, can he state the cause of the delay in their not doing so.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Congested Districts Board have purchased the Bird Estate and have agreed to purchase the O'Donovan Estate, but it has not yet been vested in them. Another estate belonging to Messrs. Bird and Harding, and one belonging to Miss Browne were offered for sale to the Board in January. The Inspector's Reports on these estates will be brought before the Board at their next meeting, when the question of purchase will be considered. There has been no delay in dealing with the matter.

Belfast Factory Workers.

Mr. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state the number of women and young girls employed in the mills, factories, and workshops in Belfast, and also the number of such persons who are under the age of eighteen years or half-timers; and, if not, whether he will have a Return prepared giving this information.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I have not the figures for which the hon. Member asks, but I may refer him to the Report on the conditions of work in flax and linen mills made in 1904 by Sir Hamilton Freer-Smith, superintending inspector of factories, on pages 18 and 19 of which he will find some tables of statistics of persons employed in flax factories. If these contain sufficient information for his purpose he will perhaps not think it necessary to ask for a special Return, which would take considerable time and trouble to prepare.

Irish Factory Inspection.

MR. J. DEVLIN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the high death rate in Belfast from pulmonary consumption, and to the fact that the death rate is highest amongst mill and factory workers, the vast majority of whom are females; whether there is any female factory inspector in Belfast; and, if not, whether, in view of the number of women and young girls employed in mills and factories in Belfast, he will consider the advisability of appointing a female inspector for that city and the North of Ireland generally.

MR. GLADSTONE: The figures given in the Report of the Registrar-General for Ireland for the year 1905 do not appear to me to show any necessary connection between the death rate in Belfast from tubercular disease, and employment in the linen factories. I may point out, however, that the conditions obtaining in flax and linen mills have been made the subject of a special inquiry by Sir Hamilton Freer-Smith, to whose Report I have just alluded, and that, as the result, new regulations for the industry have just been established dealing with the removal of dust, humidity in the air, steam, wet, etc., which should do much to improve the health of the workers. I shall be happy to send the hon. Member a copy. With regard to the last part of the Question, one of the lady inspectors resides in Belfast for two-thirds of each year, devoting her time chiefly to inspection in that city. Others of the lady inspectors also visit Ireland occasionally.

Political Pensions.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, having regard to his declaration last session that he was opposed to political pensions, he will now give facilities for the further progress of the Bill for their repeal, which has been read a second time without a division.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir, the declaration was of a purely personal kind, and I am opposed to the cancelling of existing pensions contemplated by this Bill.

Empire Day.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the fact that official recognition is now made of Empire Day in nearly every portion of the Empire except the United Kingdom, he will take steps to have the day officially recognised in the United Kingdom.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir; as at present advised I doubt if sufficient interest is taken in this day to justify its official recognition.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Would the right hon. Gentleman consider the propriety of officially recognising Tariff Reform Day?

MR. HUNT: Will the right hon. Gentleman do his best to get Empire Day recognised all over the country?

[No Answer was returned.]

Government Messengerships.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister how many appointments have been made to permanent messengerships in Government offices since January, 1906, and what was the occupation of the different men prior to appointment.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am afraid that the labour in compiling this information would be out of all proportion to the value of the result.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT: How many appointments have been made?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot say.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT: The labour involved could not be very great.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have given the information supplied me by the Department.

Boards of Education and Agriculture.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will take any steps to co-ordinate the functions of the Boards of Education and of Agriculture in connection with the provision of technical education and agriculture.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I understand that the question of coordinating the functions of the Boards of Education and of Agriculture in connection with technical and agricultural education is under the consideration of the respective Presidents of the Boards; and I am not yet in a position to state what steps they propose to take in the matter.

Naval Policy.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the policy of His Majesty's Government with reference to the Navy is that if foreign countries extend their programmes we, in our turn, will also extend our programme in order to keep our relative position amongst naval Powers.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I would refer the hon. Member to the statements of naval policy made in both houses on Wednesday last week.

Irish Members and the Secretary to the Treasury.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether an opportunity will be given for the discussion of the Vote upon which the salary of the Secretary to the Treasury is borne upon an early date.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot yet say when the Treasury Vote will be taken.

Irish University Education Bill.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister when it is now proposed to introduce the Bill providing for the rearrangement of higher education in Ireland.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am unable to make any announcement at present. Due notice will be given.

Irish Council Bills.

MR. BARRIE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister when it is now proposed to introduce the Bill providing for the formation of a central council in Ireland.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am sorry to have to keep on giving such Answers one after another. My right hon. friend the Chief Secretary has already given this information to the House. So far as we can see the Bill will be introduced on the 7th May.

Scottish Committee of the Privy Council on Education.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, seeing that the right of the public to know how the business of the Government is carried on is acknowledged by the regular publication of the dates of Cabinet meetings and the names of the Ministers who attend them, he will, in the case of the meetings of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education in Scotland, publish the names of the members of that Committee who attend these meetings; and whether, notwithstanding the absence of the precedent, he will now direct that the dates of meetings of the Committee, and the names of the members present should be regularly communicated to this House and the public.

SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware that any injury has been done to the public interest by the fact of such meetings not being published, and I do not see the necessity of instituting a new practice.

MR. SMEATON asked whether the advice which the Prime Minister gave the other day to "have done with these tomfooleries" should not be adopted in regard to this phantom Committee.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I should be sorry to apply such a word as "tomfoolery" to an institution which has lasted so long as this one.

MR. MORTON: Is it not the fact that the whole thing is a farce? The Committee never meets at all and is never summoned.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I should never think of using such language as that.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) asked as to the business for next week.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said that on Monday next it was proposed to take the Second Reading of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, and the debate would be continued on Tuesday if necessary. Wednesday's business would include Report of the financial Resolutions and some minor Bills.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: And Thursday?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I will state that next week. We have an idea in our minds as to it.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Is it not to be devoted to Irish Supply?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Yes, that is what is in our minds owing to certain circumstances which have transpired in this House.

SELECTION (SCOTTISH STANDING COMMITTEE).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection, That the following Members representing Scottish constituencies are appointed to serve on the Standing Committee for the consideration of all Public Bills relating exclusively to Scotland and committed to a Standing Committee:—The Lord Advocate, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. Robert Balfour, Mr. Barnes, Mr. Beale, Sir Arthur Bignold, Mr. Bryce, Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Caldwell, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Cleland, Sir Thomas Glen Coats, Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Sir Henry Craik, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Cross, Lord Dalmeny, Viscount Dalrymple, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Arthur Dewar, Mr. John Dewar, Mr. Robert Duncan, the Master of Elibank, Mr. Erskine, Mr. Esslemont, Mr. Munro Ferguson, Mr. Findlay, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. John Gulland, Mr. Secretary Haldane, Mr. Leicester Harmsworth, Mr. John Henderson, Mr. John Deans Hope, Sir John Jardine, Mr. Laidlaw, Mr. Lamont, Mr. Murray Macdonald, Mr. John M'Callum, Mr. M'Crae, Sir Lewis M'Iver, Major M'Micking, Mr. Menzies, Mr. Molteno, Mr. Secretary Morley, Mr. James Murray, Mr. Morton, Mr. Pirie, Mr. Charles Price, Sir Robert Pullar, Dr. Rainy, Mr. Edmund Robertson, Mr. Sinclair, Mr. Smeaton, Mr. Halley Stewart, Mr. Solicitor-General for Scotland, Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Tennant, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Sir Andrew Torrance, Sir John Batty Tuke, Captain Waring, Mr. Eugene Wason, Mr. Cathcart Wason, Mr. Watt, Mr. Weir, Mr. Dundas White, Mr. Wilkie, Mr. Williamson, Mr. M'Kinnon Wood, and Mr. Younger.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure: — Mr. William Abraham (Cork), the Lord Advocate, Mr. Adkins, Mr. Harmood-Banner, Mr. Barnard, Mr. Barran, Mr. Beckett, Mr. Billson, Mr. Boland, Mr. Bowles, Mr. Brace, Mr. Bright, Viscount Castlereagh, Mr. Cave, Mr. Chance, Mr. Clynes, Mr. Cobbold, Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Charles Craig, Mr. Herbert Craig, Mr. Ellis Davies, Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Clement Edwards, Mr. Evans, Mr. George Faber (York), Mr. Fletcher, Mr. Flynn, Sir Henry Fowler, Mr. Gwynn, Mr. William Harvey, Mr. Harwood, Mr. James Haslam, Mr. Healy, Colonel Herbert, Mr. Higham, Mr. Hodge, Mr. Bateman Hope, Sir John Jardine, Mr. Vincent Kennedy, Mr. Lambton, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Lehmann, Sir Francis Lowe, Mr. Massie, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. Napier, Mr. Nussey, Mr. Pickersgill, Sir Francis Powell, Mr. Rainy, Mr. Rees, Mr. Compton Rickett, Mr. Charles Roberts, Mr. Samuel Roberts, Mr. Soares, Mr. Solicitor-General, Sir Benjamin Stone, Mr. John Taylor, Mr. Thornton, Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Waldron, Mr. Walker, Mr. Joseph Walton, and Mr. Whitehead.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had added to Standing Committee A the following fifteen Members in respect of the Advertisements Regulation Bill:—Lord Balcarres, Mr. Hart-Davies, Mr. Wyndham, Sir Charles Schwann, Mr. Butcher, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. Beale, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Bell, Mr. Beauchamp, Mr. Bertram Straus, Dr. Shipman, Mr. King, Mr. Rendall, and Mr. Morrell.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee, That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee B, in respect of the Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill :—Mr. Burns, Dr. Macnamara, and Mr. Solicitor-General ; and had added the following eighteen Members in respect of the Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill :—Mr. Birrell, Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland, Mr. Solicitor-General for Ireland, Mr. Walter Long, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Fetherstonhaugh, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Ainsworth, Mr. O'Grady, Mr. Clancy, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Dillon, Mr. Hayden, Mr. M'Hugh, Mr. O'Shee, Mr. Devlin, and Mr. T. P. O'Connor.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee, That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill :—Sir Edward Strachey ; and had added the following Sixteen Members (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill) :—Mr. Solicitor-General, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, Mr. Maddison, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Collings, Mr. Meysey-Thompson, Viscount Turnour, Mr. Maclaren, Mr. Dundas White, Mr. Branch, Mr. Croydon Marks, Mr. Crossley, Mr. Astbury, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Agnew, and Sir Francis Channing.

SIR WILLIAM BRAMPTON GOURDON further reported from the Committee, That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A :—Mr. Rothschild; and had appointed in substitution Mr. James Francis Mason.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

LIGHTS ON VEHICLES BILL.

Reported from the Standing Committee on Law, etc., with Amendments.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 129.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 129.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Tuesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 168.]

MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS BILL.

"To amend The Municipal Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Act, 1884," presented by Mr. Cleland ; supported by Mr. M'Crae, Mr. Barnes, Major Coates, Mr. Younger, Mr. Mooney, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. Adkins, and Mr. M'Kinnon Wood ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 170.]

NAVAL LANDS (VOLUNTEERS) BILL.

"To extend the Military Lands Acts to Naval and Marine Volunteers," presented by Mr. Edmund Robertson ; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 171.]

SUPPLY [6TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT, Oldham, in the chair.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,758,400, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad, including the cost of Superintendence, Purchase of Sites, Grants in Aid, and other Charges connected therewith, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908."

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. LAMBERT, Devonshire, South Molton) said the policy of the present Board of Admiralty had been that of continuity. That principle had been followed in regard to shipbuilding, the distribution of the Fleet, the training of officers, and other matters of purely technical concern, but there was a sharp break in financial methods. If the precedent of the last ten years had been followed he would during that session have had to move another Loan Bill to carry out the works sanctioned under the Loan Act of 1905. But he thought all fair-minded Members would agree that borrowing in the last ten years had been unduly and unwisely extended. The present Government had not only decided that no new works should be provided for under Loan Bills, but they were determined to finish the old loan works out of revenue. The temptation to do otherwise had been strong, but the Chancellor of the Exchequer had successfully resisted it. As a consequence the naval Votes this year would have to bear £900,000 in addition to the ordinary naval expenditure voted by the House. Borrowing powers had been taken to the amount of £27,593,000 during the last ten years whereas the Loan Act of 1905 sanctioned a total expenditure of £32,206,000. The Government had very carefully revised the several loan items. They had cut out everything not essential and taken into account the redistribution of the Fleet. Of course, there must also be considered the difficulty of forecasting, when the Loan Act of 1905 was brought in, what would be the actual necessities of the Fleet in 1907–8. This careful revision had enabled the Government to reduce the total loan expenditure from £32,206,000 to £29,840,000. They had to deduct from that £29,840,000 borrowing powers to the amount of £27,593,000. The naval Votes, therefore, in this year, next year, and the year afterwards would have to bear a total of £2,246,000. As to repayment of annuity, that would have to be borne over a good many years altogether. The policy of the present Government in transferring expenditure on the works to revenue would result in a saving of £117,000 a year for the next thirty years. The reduction effected in the items of the Loan Bill would mean another saving of £123,000 a year, making a total of £240,000 saved on this annuity for the next thirty years. The annuity would reach its maximum in 1910–11, when it would be £1,350,000 a year. It would remain stationary about fifteen years and then be gradually reduced. The last payment under the Loan Act of 1905 would be made in 1938–9. If posterity had done nothing for us, we certainly had done something for posterity, and he could only hope that in those happy days they would be able to commiserate us on having lived in a more brutal age. If peace and good will did not then prevail the people who lived in 1938–9 would have to pay for their own and for some of our works as well. He would sketch the result of the works that had been sanctioned and were in process of completion under the various Loan Acts that had been passed during the ten years. At Gibraltar somewhat over £5,000,000 had been spent upon a harbour, commercial mole, extension of the dockyard, and magazines. It would be very interesting indeed to know the total of the enormous expenditure on the fortifications of Gibraltar. Over £2,000,000 would have been spent at Malta by the time the breakwaters, extension, magazines, coal and oil-fuel storage had been completed in 1910. At Hong Kong, on the extension of the dockyard and coaling facilities nearly £2,000,000 had been spent. At Simon's Bay the expenditure on the new dockyard would have amounted to over £2,000,000 by 1909. At Keyham, Devonport, nearly £6,000,000 had been devoted to an extension of the dockyard, barracks and minor items. At Chatham nearly £2,000,000 had gone in the dock, barracks, and hospital. At Dover, to enclose a harbour of 610 acres in such an exposed position—a work which it was hoped would be finished in 1910—would cost £3,500,000. At Portland, the expenditure amounted to nearly £1,000,000. At Bermuda, dockyard extension accounted for £600,000; the expenditure at Portsmouth amounted to £2,000,000; and miscellaneous services were answerable for £2,500,000 more. Out of this last sum five churches had been added to the naval strength of the country.

*MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrew's Burghs): What about Rosyth?

*MR. LAMBERT said he would come to that in due course. He proposed to give a few figures as to the docking accommodation for large vessels. They had at home five Government docks capable of taking the "Dreadnought"; abroad three. All these belonged to the Government.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Where are those at home?

*MR. LAMBERT said that of the docks at home four were at Keyham and one at Portsmouth. Of docks belonging to the Government capable of taking the "Invincible" type there were eight at home and three abroad. In British territory there were twenty-seven docks capable of taking the "Dreadnought" and "Invincible." The

"Invincible" being longer than the "Dreadnought," some docks would accommodate her that would not accommodate the "Dreadnought," and there were others which would take the latter but not the "Invincible." Having sketched as briefly as he could these various items, he might now come to the question of new works. In the first place there had been a considerable amount of alarm expressed at the alleged unhealthy conditions which prevailed at Osborne among the cadets. He could dispel this alarm by saying that they had taken the utmost pains to inquire into the causes of epidemics that had unhappily raged at Osborne; and he thought he could not do better than read to the House the extract from the Report of the visit of the Medical Director-General, accompanied by several other medical men. That was on 21st November last, and their Report said—

> "There appears to us to be a special reason why epidemics should, in spite of every care on the part of the officials, be prone to occur among the cadets. It is because a large number of boys at a susceptible age are passed through the college in a time much shorter than obtains in public schools, and there is a continual supply of susceptible subjects."

Of course, Osborne differed from any other educational establishment. They had there something like 400 boys of from thirteen to fifteen years of age, and they were told that this was the most susceptible age for catching diseases such as chicken-pox, measles and the like. It was proposed to build a new infectious hospital at Osborne to hold sixty beds, at a cost of £20,000. There had been an expression of opinion that the material of which Osborne was built might be a cause of the sickness; but a distinguished surgeon had reported as follows—

> "I have had a chemical examination made of a sample of this material. There is no free acid of any kind in this material, and in my opinion it is quite free from any irritant properties."

He hoped that those opinions of eminent medical men would allay any alarm that might have been caused. He could assure the Committee that they would do all in their power to prevent disease at Osborne, and it was with that view that they had sanctioned the proposal to build a hospital with sixty beds for infectious cases. At Shotley, also, they proposed to increase the hospital accommodation from sixty-two beds to 114 beds. Another subject was that of the Portsmouth lock. Last year his right hon. friend made a statement about it, and they included a sum of £900,000 to execute the work. They had been met by many difficulties. Various schemes had been proposed to the Admiralty, and he was sorry to say that great exception had been taken to each by officials at the Admiralty and at the Portsmouth dockyard. It was a very serious thing indeed so to pull about the old dockyard as to construct a lock of the length required at Portsmouth. The proposal to spend something like £750,000 or £1,000,000 upon the building of a lock in the dockyards might paralyse, and certainly would demoralise, the work there for a considerable time. One proposal was to widen the existing lock, but it was thought that the lock would not be strong enough to stand the strain. Another proposal was to cut through the coaling point, but that was open to the obvious objection that they would have to find another place for coal. The Board of Admiralty, having carefully considered everything, consulted an outside firm of engineers, though not from any lack of confidence in the officials of the Works Department of the Admiralty. They acted on the principle of a person who might be ill, that it was no disparagement of the ordinary medical adviser if an outside specialist were called in. He wanted to get rid of the idea that there was the smallest shadow of disparagement of the present officers of the Admiralty. During the sixteen months he had been there he was perfectly certain that no Department of the Government, nor any outside Department, was served with more fidelity or more ability than was the Admiralty in the Works Department. But this matter was so important that they took the advice of an eminent firm of outside engineers, and they hoped soon to have their Report which had been unavoidably delayed. That was all he could state about the Portsmouth lock at the present moment. The hon. Gentleman had asked him about Rosyth. There was a sum of £10,000 in the Estimates for the Rosyth works, the history of which had been a somewhat chequered one. In March, 1900, a Committee was appointed to consider the accommodation of ships. They reported early in 1902 that there was a serious deficiency of accommodation for long battleships and cruisers at some stations. They added that the expansion of our present naval ports would be very difficult, and they recommended another naval establishment as the best solution of the difficulty. At the end of March, 1902, there were bought 1,144 acres at the cost of £144,000. In 1903 sketch plans were prepared to provide berthing accommodation for one fourth of the War Fleet in 1908–9. These designs were completed in 1904. The designs and estimates were for a complete naval base to cost £10,000,000. Before these designs were fully finished, a great departure took place in Admiralty policy. Old ships were scrapped, and at the beginning of 1905 there was no need for this berthing accommodation. Various plans had been proposed since, not for berthing accommodation, but for a dock and basin, and other matters. There was a definite scheme decided upon in August 1905 to cost £2,300,000. That was a considerable reduction on the £10,000,000. That scheme was proposed just as the present Government came into office; but when the skilled advisers to the Admiralty had to pronounce upon it very grave objections to it were found. It was therefore determined to get the fullest information as to the sub-soil, and a series of investigations were carried out by the superintending engineer. They had sunk a cylinder, and the results of all the experiments were now before the Admiralty. They would be carefully considered by the Board, and further than that he could not go at present.

*MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: You cannot tell whether they are satisfactory?

*MR LAMBERT said he could not; they had not been considered by the Board of Admiralty yet. There was a new work which possibly might be of interest to Irish Members. He had stated just now that we had at home five Government docks. It was proposed to build another. Haulbowline dock was completed in 1890, but it was only 411 feet long, and was therefore inadequate, though wide enough, to take a ship of the "Dreadnought" type. They proposed to extend it to 600 feet, and it would then be big enough for any existing or projected warships. The reason for lengthening the dock was that Berehaven was one of the principal headquarters of the seagoing fleet. Berehaven was ninety miles from Haulbowline, where, if a ship was damaged, she could put in, when the dock was completed. Berehaven was 250 miles from Devonport; therefore, if a ship was injured at Berehaven, she would have to steam 250 miles through a rough sea to reach Devonport, a circumstance which the Admiralty could not view without concern. The total Vote was £2,758,400, which was an apparent increase of £803,900. In reality there was a decrease, because they had had to provide on the Vote £870,825 for work which would have been paid for by loan, if they had not adopted the new policy. There was also an increase of £120,000, on the loan-repayment annuity, and they had therefore had to provide for extra expenditure outside the ordinary Vote to the extent of £991,000. There was, in reality, a real decrease in the Vote of £187,000. He was sure the House of Commons would approve of the policy of paying their way. It was useless to pay off debt with one hand and to borrow money for Naval works with the other. The Admiralty hoped in this Vote and in others to give the country value for their money. All non-essentials had been eliminated, but there had been no undue cheeseparing. The sum asked for was only what, in their opinion, was necessary for the efficiency of this branch of Naval defence.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE said he did not know whether the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down thought that by combining brevity of speech with paucity of information he would thereby assist the passage of the Vote, but personally he rather doubted it, and he was really amazed at the perfunctory manner in which he had touched upon some very grave questions affecting not only the efficiency but the actual safety of some of the most valuable ships in His Majesty's Navy. He would deal with these points in detail, and commence with a review of the financial aspect of the Vote. It was perfectly clear that the Vote was of unusual importance this year, owing to the fact that a number of very important works had been transferred from the

Naval Works Loan to the Vote, and the hon. Gentleman talked of that as if it were an entirely new policy. It was nothing of the kind. He would be the last person to object to the principle which hon. Gentlemen had advocated, of paying their way out of Votes in view of the fact that he himself, when he was in the hon. Gentleman's position, advocated publicly in the House again and again this particular change, and had actually initiated it. On the 3rd of March, 1904, in the House he said—

> "It was the hope of the Admiralty that they would be in a position to discontinue the system of borrowing for works, and to construct them out of the Estimates. It was obvious, however, that there must be a transition period, and they were now putting such works as they could on Vote 10. That accounted for some of the large items to be found on the Vote."

And again, speaking as Civil Lord, on 28th July, 1905, he said—

> "He had never concealed his own desire that they (*i.e.* the Loans) should be brought to an end as soon as that could conveniently be done, but it had not been practicable before now. This Bill marked a great step in that direction. The transference, however, of certain of this expenditure to the Votes would, he warned the House, involve an increase of £340,000 to £350,000 in next year's Naval Estimates."

Moreover, in pursuance of that policy, before they left office the late Government did transfer one of the largest items of all, that of Rosyth, from the Works Loan to Vote 10. The present Government, however, when they came into office, cut out that item from the Vote, and put it back on the Loan, which amounted to a reversal of the policy of transference from Loan to Vote which in that way had been initiated. He could not admit that the Government deserved any special credit for this particular reform, except in so far as it continued a policy already initiated by the late Government. But, after all, it was not professions or statements of principle which were important in this matter; it was the application of the principle. And here he came to what was apparently a conflict of opinion between the hon. Gentleman and the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty. On 5th March, in explaining the policy of the Government, the right hon. Gentleman said that their unexhausted borrowing powers would be used as far as they would go; and the right hon. Gentleman went on to point out that there was practically £2,000,000 more to borrow. In other words, the Government, while it was going to stop this "vicious principle" of borrowing, at the same time was going to borrow every single penny that the law allowed, to the tune of this £2,000,000. He thought, therefore, that the principle of paying their way out of Votes was still very much in its infancy. There was another point on which the right hon. Gentleman spoke last March, which also required a little explanation on the financial side. He suggested that it was contemplated to transfer the interest payments, under the previous Works Loans Act, from Vote 10, under which it now appeared, to the National Debt. [Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No.] Well, here were the right hon. Gentleman's words—

> "The Navy Estimates will have to bear a dead weight of over £1,250,000 annually, on account of past expenditure unless these payments are transferred to the National Debt. It is immaterial to the country how the money is paid."

Was that the course that the right hon. Gentleman wished to pursue? He sincerely hoped that it was not, because the present system of payment provided for both interest and sinking fund, and for the extinction of the debt in the present generation. He could not endorse the hon. Gentleman's optimistic idea that by 1938–9 the world would have so advanced that there would be no necessity for Navies or Naval works. But surely it was not immaterial to the country that the present system might possibly be abandoned, and that this debt should be transferred to the National Debt of the country. He had no doubt that it would have the effect of making the Naval Estimates look slimmer at the time, and that possibly it might be used as another card for the Hague Conference, but it was certainly unsound finance. He had said just now that he did not object to the principle of transfer from Loan to Vote; but there were serious abuses which might result from its operation and there was one danger which he thought must have been foreseen by everybody who had studied the subject. If it was the case that the old system of constructing works under Loan occasionally led to extravagance, it was equally clear that the new system, at any rate under a

Liberal Government, must almost inevitably lead to a dangerous starving of necessary and even of essential naval works. This was an old story; it had been the history of these naval works in the past; in fact it was the sole and direct cause of the necessity of introducing the long series of Loan Bills which was now drawing to a close. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty had made some very wise remarks on this subject. In a debate some three years ago, on 3rd March, 1904, he said these words—

> "The Works Vote in former days was not the handmaid, but it was the Cinderella of the Navy Vote, and it was snubbed and robbed. That was in the days before Civil Lords were efficient Ministers. It was no doubt starved and plundered, and in the days before the Naval Works Acts it had reached dangerously small figures . . . . . He admitted that the figures were too low before the Naval Works Acts were passed, and it was because they were too low that those Acts were introduced."

That was undoubtedly the origin of this loan expenditure, and he was afraid that it was too clearly evident that there was a tendency in Vote 10 to repeat the state of affairs which led to the introduction of the loan expenditure. There were two methods by which the starving of necessary works might be carried out. One was that they might abandon altogether, or postpone, works that were absolutely essential, thereby inflicting a grave injury on the Navy, and leading to panic expenditure later on. Another method was the even more pernicious process of starving works which had been actually sanctioned and begun, through the granting of insignificant yearly doles. Either of these systems was grossly unfair to any succeeding Government, because they would be compelled later on to grapple with the accumulated arrears by embarking on a vast capital expenditure. He protested, therefore, against the action of the Government in respect of two important items at least in the Vote. These were Rosyth and the new lock at Portsmouth. The hon. Gentleman had given them a history, though not an altogether impartial history, of the Rosyth works. He had told them correctly that the original idea was approved by the Board of Admiralty in 1902, that the site was purchased and examined and that the plans worked up in 1903–4. But the hon. Gentleman was not quite fair in the matter of what subsequently took place. He said that a scheme was elaborated for establishing a first-class dockyard at a cost of £10,000,000, and that the scheme which was afterwards produced showed that the Admiralty had changed its mind.

*MR. LAMBERT: I said the conditions were altered.

*MR. LEE: Quite so, and that had of course influenced the decision of the Amiralty. He had explained at considerable length on introducing the Naval Works Loans Bill in 1905 that the late Government ordered plans to be drawn up for the fullest utilisation of the site purchased, in case it should become necessary to use it in years to come, because it had been only too evident in past instances that by planning a dockyard on too small a small scale, not thinking of the future, and then attempting to extend it, they found themselves obliged to clear away works already made and generally they had no coherent and natural scheme of expansion upon which to proceed. Therefore on these sole grounds the late Government laid down, on paper only, the plans of this large dockyard, but they did not intend to construct it then, and at the period when the scheme was laid before the House of Commons in August, 1905, it provided for a small self-contained naval base which could be expanded if necessary, and on which the total expenditure was to be under £2,500,000. That item was then transferred from the Loan Account to Vote 10. They handed over the Vote in that condition to the present Government, who for reasons best known to themselves, cut the item out of the Vote. It reappeared this year with no total estimate and with nothing but a miserable instalment of £10,000 in respect of works which were to cost over £2,000,000. Last year, however, they used language which was exceedingly emphatic as to the vital necessity of constructing this base at Rosyth. Reading from a document the right hon. Gentleman said the Admiralty had no intention of departing from the scheme, because it was an imperative necessity that this base should be provided on the east coast, but that was the position of this project to-day after four years of consideration? In proportion to the total cost of the works the sum of £10,000 to be spent this year was ridiculous. It was not sufficient to enable the Government to let the main contract even if it was passed by the House. Really, after all this expenditure of time, he felt that the Government were trifling with the Committee and the country about this question of Rosyth. It was a most lamentable example of the system of starving works by indefinite postponement. They had brought forward no valid excuse for further delay. The preliminary works were admittedly completed, together with the railway connections, water supply, borings, and other matters which had to be attended to in the first place. The Civil Lord had referred to the sinking of the cylinder as a matter which was still under consideration, but he knew perfectly well that that had been done most successfully. The results showed that the site was peculiarly advantageous from an engineering point of view. There was, therefore, no reason whatever, except the financial reason, for not going on with the work. There had been various incidents connected with the business at Rosyth. They were informed in December last that the superintending engineer was to be withdrawn and sent to Portsmouth because there was no work for him to do, and then later he was ordered to remain, but he was given a staff ridiculously inadequate for the purpose of going on with the work at all. In answer to a Question asked yesterday the hon. Gentleman stated the total engineering staff now at Rosyth consisted of six persons, who had also to look after the whole of the coastguard services in Scotland. He thought they were justified in saying that the Government did not mean business in this question of Rosyth. It was not necessary to emphasise again the urgency of this work, which the right hon. Gentleman himself admitted so forcibly last year. Even under the most favourable circumstances and with unlimited funds, it would take seven or eight years to complete the work. Who could foresee what would be our international relationships in seven years time? The work ought to be pressed on with all possible despatch. The necessity for it had been more than ever emphasised by the establishment of the new Home Fleet, sometimes called the North Sea Fleet. They were told that it was to be based on ports immediately in the vicinity of the North Sea. In the meantime they were told that it was based on Sheerness. He felt bound to investigate a little more closely the alleged claim that this Fleet was already provided with a base. Sheerness was practically an open roadstead. It was an absolutely impracticable and unsafe base in time of war. It was exposed to torpedo attack at any time, and as a matter of fact first-class battleships could only cross the bar and get into the roadstead eight hours out of the twenty-four, and wounded ships could only cross the bar at high water, and yet this was supposed to be a base for the Home Fleet. Chatham was quite useless as a base, the access to it being so precarious. He remembered that a calculation was made that access to it could only be obtained 150 days in the whole year. There was no dock whatever there capable of taking in the "Dreadnought" or the "Invincible." The next nearest port was Portsmouth. There again it was admitted by the right hon. Gentleman that there was only one dock which was even theoretically capable of taking in the "Dreadnought." The docks at Portsmouth were so situated that they could only be entered by the largest vessels six hours out of the twenty-four, and in the case of the "Dreadnought," they could only be entered through an emergency entrance which could not be used in certain directions of the wind and tide, and which in any case was most unsafe. The nearest available base, therefore, was Devonport, and in the absence of Rosyth wounded ships would have to traverse 275 miles, after passing the Straits of Dover, of narrow waters probably infested with torpedo craft before they could reach a place of safety and be docked. Speaking of the necessity for a new dock at Haulbowline, the right hon. Gentleman said that vessels at Berehaven in order to get to Devonport "would have to traverse 250 miles of water, which was a contingency the Admiralty could not contemplate without apprehension." Surely that was a strong reinforcement of his argument. It was absurd to suppose that these ships could be provided with an adequate base at Devonport if they had to traverse 275 miles of narrow waters, exposed to attack all the way. As to the entrance to Portsmouth, the Civil Lord, speaking last year in very forcible language in regard to the urgent necessity for a new dock entrance, said—

> "The Board of Admiralty, with a due sense of responsibility in the matter, thought it essential that this new lock should be constructed. It was impossible for large ships such as the "Dreadnought" to enter the existing locks. All those who had knowledge of naval matters would know that to take a ship into a basin with both caissons open, would be rather a serious matter should an accident occur, and the ships in the basin would run the risk of considerable damage. Therefore it was proposed by this new work to construct a lock 850 feet long, 110 feet wide, and 33 feet at low-water level."

But what was the Government doing to carry out this urgent work which was to cost nearly a million sterling? They put in the Estimates of last year a sum of £10,000 of which only £250 had been spent, no doubt, mainly in correspondence. This year they put down another £10,000, though apparently nothing whatever had been done. The hon. gentleman's excuse was that there were a number of rival schemes, and that the Admiralty could not make up its mind which was the proper one.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee) was understood to say that they were asking outside advice.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE said they were calling in outside advice, but it was perfectly absurd to suppose that the professional advisers of the Admiralty could not make up their minds on a comparatively simple matter of this kind in eighteen months. At any rate, from his own knowledge of the Works Department of the Admiralty, which the hon. Gentleman so justly eulogised, and which had carried out the greatest engineering works of this kind all over the world, he absolutely refused to believe that those splendid engineers were so incompetent as to be unable in eighteen months to work out a scheme for a new lock entrance at Portsmouth. The delay was obviously a financial one. It was very convenient, when the Government wanted delay, to point out that experts differed. He supposed that had been a common device of all Governments at different times. The fact appeared to be that the Government did not wish to provide the necessary money on the Naval Estimates lest they should appear too large. That was a dangerous policy, and he would almost say that it was scandalous, in view of the accidents which had recently happened at Portsmouth in connection with the docking of vessels. He thought the fact ought to be clearly recognised by the Committee and the public that within the last few months they had very nearly had a most serious accident to the "Dreadnought," which, as he had said, could only be got into the basin at all through an emergency entrance, which was not safe in certain states of the weather. The "Dreadnought," on the occasion to which he referred, stuck in the entrance of No. 15 dock, and considerably damaged both the dock and herself. That was a very serious matter indeed, for if it had not been for a remarkable stroke of luck, the "Dreadnought" would have broken her back. Again, there was the case of the "Britannia," a first-class battleship, which was entering the "Deep" or tidal dock, and owing to the insufficient margin she stuck in the entrance, just as the tide was turning, and it was only by a miracle, and by the use of several dockyard tugs, that she was hauled clear just in time to save her from breaking her back. It was common rumour in Portsmouth that the Admiral in command of the station had notified the Admiralty that he refused to take those ships of the largest class into dock under those conditions. He thought it was extremely probable that that rumour was true. In spite of all this the Government were trifling with the matter. They were putting down a ridiculously small sum on the Estimates, and they had not informed the House of the serious facts to which he had just alluded. He would not at this stage make any comments upon less important items in the Vote; but he asserted that they on the Opposition side of the House were justified in entering a most vigorous protest against a return to the system of starving works which prevailed a generation ago, and which, if persisted in, would impose once again on the successors of the existing Government a burdensome and unfair obligation to meet the accumulation of arrears by vast capital expenditure and perhaps a fresh series of Loans Bills.

MR. JENKINS (Chatham) said he trusted the country would not be scared after reading the speech of the hon. Member for Fareham; and he hoped that the right hon. Member for Dundee would give to him a very pertinent reply. He could not accept all that the hon. Gentleman had said as to the naval bases of the country. At the same time, the hon. Gentleman had had experience at the Board of Admiralty in the last Government, although, in order to build up a case for Portsmouth, he had discounted the existence of other naval bases such as Plymouth, Devonport, and Chatham. He (Mr. Jenkins) was not opposed to the policy of the Admiralty in so far as this Vote was concerned; he would certainly support it. What he would suggest was that the Admiralty had not gone far enough. They had heard from the hon. Gentleman that there were at the present time five dry-docks that would accommodate the "Dreadnought"; and these were at Keyham, Devonport, and Portsmouth. His contention was that it was of the greatest importance that there should be a dry-dock at every naval base in the country sufficiently large to accommodate our largest ships. There were eight dry docks that could accommodate an "Invincible." The "Dreadnought" was not very much larger than the ships of the "Invincible" class, although she might have a little more beam. Why not increase those docks in length and breadth? It could easily be done; and in that event there would be a dry dock at every station at which a fleet was stationed. They were told that there were ten private docks in the country which could accommodate ships of the "Dreadnought" class; but these were built as a private speculation and for the accommodation of the huge merchant vessels now being launched. The argument put forth at times in favour of work being given by the Admiralty to private contractors for the construction of warships was that in time of war we should undoubtedly stand in need of assistance from those private firms. What he wanted to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty was whether the Government could commandeer those private docks at any time the Admiralty might require them? He ventured to say that it was impossible to do so; and, therefore, he submitted that in the national dockyards in the United Kingdom there should be at least one dry-dock sufficient to admit not only vessels of the "Dreadnought" class, but vessels of an even larger size. It would be only wise on the part of the Admiralty to look ahead and consider whether it might not be necessary to build in the future larger ships than the "Dreadnought." The Civil Lord of the Admiralty said that they had spent £2,000,000 at Chatham in the construction of docks. Was he to understand that that was for a dry or a wet dock?

*Mr. LAMBERT: It was for a dock, barracks and other works.

Mr. JENKINS said he understood that nearly £1,000,000 had been paid by the country for a ship-way which was sufficiently large to build a ship almost as large again as the "Dreadnought," but it was only used for building small barges. He saw that a sum of £2,800 was set aside for the lengthening of No. 2 dock at Chatham. Did that apply to a dry dock or a wet dock? If it applied to the lengthening of a drydock, he asked whether that dock would be sufficiently large to take in the "Dreadnought?" He entirely agreed with the policy of the Admiralty in making a drydock at Haulbowline, but if they were to have dry docks at every naval base it would put the country in a more secure position. He formally moved the reduction of Item B by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item B be reduced by £100."—(*Mr. Jenkins.*)

Sir F. BANBURY (City of London) said the policy of the Government to reduce expenditure on naval works at any possible cost must lead to the most disastrous results. He was a great disciple of the principles of economy, and was always pleased when expenditure was diminished, but true economy did not merely mean not spending a certain amount of money, but spending what was absolutely necessary to provide for the safety of the country. The way to secure efficiency was to spend money at the proper time and the present was a suitable moment, as the finances of the country were in as flourishing a condition as they were likely to be for some time to come. The Admiralty and the Government as a whole had taken great credit for not using money by way of loan, covering it by a sinking fund spread over a number of years in order to construct these very necessary works. He thought they were yielding to a temptation not to spend money which was necessary, which they were unable to resist unless they were spurred on by hon. Members. The result of not defraying the necessary expenditure could only end in one way, and that was that they would have to resort again to the system of loans which right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite disliked so much. He made these remarks in no Party spirit, but from the point of view of real and efficient administration, and he was inclined to think that his view was the true one, that the chief object of the Admiralty and the Government was to save money regardless of the fact that the safety of the Empire must be endangered thereby. It was no use having magnificent ships, if in time of war we had not the docks into which they could be placed for purposes of repair. These great vessels cost £1,000,000 or even £2,000,000, and it seemed to him to be false economy to save £400,000 or £500,000, and in consequence lose a ship which cost £2,000,000. He urged the Government to reconsider this question. There was a sum of £940,000 for a new lock at Portsmouth. The amount already voted was £10,000, and the sum expended till the 31st March was £250, while that to be voted for 1907–8 was £20,000. That left unvoted £919,750, which was necessary to complete the work, and this was done by a Government which arrogated to itself the position of being the most business-like and most efficient Government of modern days. He did not think, however, that that could be regarded as an efficient and economical way of doing business. He made no attack upon any Government, but while the Unionist Government took up this question from his point of view fourteen or fifteen years ago, the idea of right hon. and hon. Gentlemen opposite appeared to be to put off the evil day, and to postpone payments upon anything which was not showy, and did not give to occupants of office any great credit. He asked why, when the Admiralty had engineers of their own, they should pay £2,000 salary to an outside firm of engineers.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Baronet appeared to be wandering over the whole of the Vote, but a reduction had been moved and he must confine himself to the Amendment.

SIR F. BANBURY said he had forgotten the Motion for reduction.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) asked as a point of order whether it was not competent in Committee of Supply, although an Amendment had been moved, still to refer to anything which was contained in the main Question. If the closure were moved, the whole Vote might be done with.

*THE CHAIRMAN said there was no question as to his ruling being correct under the Resolution of the House of the 9th of February, 1858.

SIR F. BANBURY, proceeding, complained that the Estimates for Simons Bay dockyard extension should have been reduced from £2,460,000 to £2,060,000, a reduction of £400,000 or one-fifth of the total estimate. He would be glad to have some explanation.

MR. MOND (Chester) was sorry that he could not agree with the hon. Baronet, although his knowledge of business matters was so vast, when he criticised the Government for only spending a small amount on a new lock at Portsmouth. He did not suppose he wanted the Government to spend a large sum of money before they had got out their plans. No business man would rush into an expenditure of £900,000 before he had prepared himself with information, especially if the matter was not urgent.

MR. ARTHUR LEE said that as the hon. Gentleman was not in the House when he was speaking he might interrupt him for a moment to say that he himself had detailed two cases where two of the best ships in the British Navy were very nearly lost owing to the neglect of the Admiralty to provide accommodation for remedying their defects.

MR. MOND said he regretted that he was not present when the hon. Gentleman spoke. But at the same time he could not imagine that the Board of

Admiralty were so careless of the best ships of the Navy that they would neglect any work necessary for their maintenance. He did not rise, however, to continue that particular discussion. He wanted to hear something from the Government upon the whole question of naval works. He was horrified to see the enormous sums that were spent on naval works. Millions of pounds had been expended on bricks and mortar for which he could not see that there had been any adequate return. Had it not been for the lucky accident of the Russo-Japanese war we should no doubt have spent millions of pounds on Wei-hai-wei in turning it into a naval base. It was only the South African War that induced the late Government to cease spending money recklessly on naval works in all parts of the world. No doubt if we had an endless purse it would be useful to have dry docks everywhere, but the experience of the Russo-Japanese war had shown that the Navy could make use of temporary places when carrying on a war. He would like to see more money spent on ships and men and less on docks and harbours. He was very doubtful, for instance, of the utility of the Dover works. The testimony of cross-Channel captains was that Dover Harbour was more dangerous to enter now in bad weather than before, and was a greater danger to navigation. On one occasion in bad weather a steamer could not get into the harbour at all and her passengers were landed on the outside of the pier. That, of course, might be due to the works not being finished. He asked how long it would be before they were, and also what useful purpose these works, costing millions of money, would serve when finished. A case for a dry dock could be established in an infinite number of places. Further he could not see that all these works should be paid for out of current revenue. Works of this kind, which were of a permanent character, were much more a capital charge than a charge on revenue. He hoped there would be some declaration by the Goverment that they had set their face against naval harbours and bases where they were not required. If there was a commercial dry dock in a particular place, there was surely no necessity to duplicate that because at some time they might have a war ship which they might require to put into it.

*CAPTAIN HERVEY (Bury St. Edmunds) said he did not wish to follow the hon. Member who had just sat down. What he thought they ought to do was to criticise the new works which were required, and get those works carried out as quickly, economically and efficiently as possible. He could conceive no place where new works were more necessary now than at Portsmouth itself, though there were a great many other places where they were required. Last year the question of docking accommodation was taken up as it was now, and they were then told that the Admiralty were considering it. That was a year ago, and they were no further forward now, so far as getting what was required was concerned. What was wanted was proper accommodation for docking our new big battleships. When the Admiralty scheme of 1889 was brought in, workshops, docks, ships and men were included in it. But when it was found that that scheme was very expensive the men were chopped off it, and the scheme was spoilt, and in consequence the Navy was very badly off for men for some time. The Admiralty had started building big ships, and ships would be bigger in the future, and unless they built, at the same time, docks to accommodate those ships, they would in the future find themselves just as inefficient in this regard as they had been handicapped in the past for lack of men. At Portsmouth there was a dock capable of taking the "Dreadnought." That dock was inside a basin, and to get to it the ship had to go from tidal waters into that basin. There were two entrances to the basin which could only be entered at high tide. The "Dreadnought" tried to get in at one of them, but owing to its position what with wind and tide it was found to be too narrow; in the case of the other entrance, that was through a double lock which was too short. The necessity of at once increasing the size of at least one of those entrances would be apparent to the Committee, for, as his hon. friend had told them, when the "Britannia" was being taken into the lock on a nearly high but falling tide she only got half way when she stuck, and it was only by a great stroke of good luck that the country did not lose £2,000,000 through her breaking her back. The Civil Lord had told the Committee that there were ten private docks available for ships of the "Dreadnought" class, but he had omitted to state that on the east coast there was not a single Government dock between Portsmouth and the north of Scotland which would accommodate the "Dreadnought." There might be one private dock that might be useful for a man-of-war in case of emergency, but there was no certainty that such a dock would be empty when required. If when it was wanted there happened to be a mercantile ship in it with her bottom out it would be a difficult thing to get her out and the warship in. He had a personal experience in the Mediterranean in peace times with a dock at Malta. Torpedo practice was taking place and a torpedo with a dummy head struck the "Nile" and made a hole in her through which the water came in hard, and it was only by the exercise of the utmost promptness that she was got into dock without unnecessary damage. They did not want unnecessary risks to be run in time of war. He did not care where the Government made the dock. He did not tie them down to Rosyth or anywhere else, but he thought a dock should be built on the east coast capable of taking a "Dreadnought." For that reason he should support the reduction, although he did not like to vote against naval supplies. He supported it because he thought the Government had not been doing the best they could to keep up all the needs of a modern Navy. The big ships they were building at this time should be built concurrently with the building of big docks to keep the big ships efficient.

Mr. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central) said that he looked upon the Rosyth transaction as a scandal and a disgrace to the Party which carried it through. The Government paid for the site £122,000, which, invested at 3 per cent., would produce £3,765 per annum, and that was the price paid for land which before was only producing £1,622. He understood that the site at Rosyth was chosen during what was called the German scare. Had the Admiralty yet come to a conclusion regarding it? What was this £10,000 going to be spent on? It was put down in a rather loose way and no statement accompanied it, and he asked for a clear statement whether they were to look upon the Rosyth base as one which would be developed in the future or as one which was going to be abandoned.

*Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) said that one or two of the observations made by the hon. Member for Chester required some comment. He had said that the naval harbour at Dover was a waste of money because the captains of Channel steamers had found that it was not so easy to get in as had been anticipated. Surely the harbour which the Channel steamers used and the new naval harbour were totally different things. The experience of the cross Channel steamers, however disagreeable, had nothing at all to do with the new naval harbour at Dover. He would like the Civil Lord to give them some information with regard to the recent grounding of the "Duke of Edinburgh." It had been said that there was considerable danger in entering the new naval harbour, and if the hon. Member would tell the Committee the nature of the Reports which the Admiralty had received with respect to the accident to the "Duke of Edinburgh" and the general capabilities of the new harbour at Dover, it would tend to quiet the minds of many hon. Members. It had been said that the extension of the dock at Simon's Bay was a waste of money. Supposing they went to war and the Suez Canal was closed, if they had to send their ships round by the Cape they would find a naval dockyard in Simon's Bay most necessary in the event of a naval action taking place off the coast of Africa. The Civil Lord of the Admiralty had said that the present Government were observing continuity of policy in naval matters and practically carrying out the broad lines of the policy laid down by the late Administration. In some ways he might congratulate them upon doing so, but surely they could not lay claim to any continuity of policy at Rosyth, or in regard to the new lock at Portsmouth. As far as Rosyth was concerned, it was practically decided by the late Board of Admiralty that £2,500,000 should be spent at Rosyth and they found now that £10,000 was put down. It was practically agreed by the late Board that £940,000 was going to be spent on the new lock at Portmouth, and the present Government had only spent £250, and they proposed to spend £20,000 during the next financial year. If the money was spent at that rate it would take fifty years to finish the new lock at Portsmouth. The Civil Lord had stated that there were four large docks at Keyham which would take the "Dreadnought" or the "Invincible" class of battleship, but he would remind the hon. Member that Keyham was not Devonport. The new Portsmouth dockyard was an instance of the Government taking credit both ways. They were taking credit for reducing the Estimates and also for reducing the National Debt. He believed he was right in saying that if a sum of money was put down last year at £10,000 for a new dock and that money was not spent it went automatically to the reduction of the National Debt. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was taking great credit for reducing the Debt, but how had he done it? Simply by starving the naval services, and not doing what the late Government considered necessary.

*Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis) said that in reply to the hon. Member for Fareham he wished to point out that although it was true that the late Government decided to abandon the Works Bill, it was one thing saying they were going to do a thing, and another thing to do it. He thought the present Government were to be congratulated upon having abandoned that policy.

Mr. ARTHUR LEE said that what he told the Committee was that the late Government made a serious beginning by transferring the whole item of £2,500,000 for Rosyth from Loans to the Vote. They approved the Vote in that way, but the present Government cut it out and put it on Loan.

*Mr. BELLAIRS said the scheme was never commenced. It remained in the air, and he hoped it would always remain in that state. He congratulated the Government upon the foresight they had shown in regard to that matter. When the late Board of Admiralty framed the estimate he did not believe they had the slightest knowledge of the foundations at Rosyth. The only intimation they had was that the Forth Bridge had to be sunk eighty-six feet deep before they reached the solid foundation. As regarded the Works Bill they found that by putting the money on the Estimate, and therefore forcing a closer scrutiny of the expenditure, they had effected an economy of £2,366,000. The abolition of the Works Bill had resulted in a saving upon the Malta breakwater of £325,000, and of £400,000 at Simon's Bay. With regard to what had been spent upon coaling facilities, many great naval authorities were against the expenditure. He agreed that it was generally unnecessary to provide such facilities, because they could get a more efficient service by using colliers, for then they would get the coal fresh without any depreciation, and it was quite possible to organise a collier service to meet the wants of the Fleet. He agreed with the hon. Member for Fareham in regard to the system of placing the money on the Estimates and spreading the expenditure over a great number of years. In that way they did not get the benefit of the expenditure until many years had elapsed. A good instance of that had been given in regard to the lock at Portsmouth which was put down to cost £940,000, and for which £10,000 was provided last year and never spent, and £20,000 this year. He found about a dozen items in which they were only proposing to spend about 10 per cent. of the total cost, and if that sort of thing went on it meant that they would spread the expenditure over a great number of years and thus reproduce all those evils which accompanied slow shipbuilding. The Civil Lord was very strong in his views about the lock at Portsmouth and he deserved great credit for his prophetic forecast. He had pictured the case of a vessel endangering all the other vessels in the basin by an accident, and some time afterwards, in addition to the accidents mentioned by the hon. Member for the Fareham Division, the "Terrible" ran into and sank a caisson in the basin. He would remind him, however, that it was no use knowing the Derby winner if he was not going to back it. In this case they had an instance where the Civil Lord possessed all the foresight necessary in regard to the lock at Portsmouth, and yet he was doing very little in the way of providing it. He wished for a few moments to draw attention to the Report of the Committee on Public Accounts for the year 1906. They had not had an opportunity of discussing those accounts, but that Committee found very serious fault with the Board of Admiralty in regard to the accounts for the year 1904, and they reported on Vote 10—

> "First on the plea of urgency, Parliament is committed to an expenditure of £35,000 for which no provision was made in the Estimates for the year; secondly, on the same plea of urgency, a departure was permitted from the general rule that tenders shall be invited for carrying out works. This expenditure was necessitated, as in many other cases, by a change of policy. The scrutiny of expenditure by subordinate officers, the criticism of errors of estimates, and in short the works of your Committee will be to a large extent useless if by the excuse of a change of policy any department can shake itself clear of Parliamentary control."

It would be seen that the Public Accounts Committee censured the Board of Admiralty for changing its policy and declared that the Admiralty was trying to shake itself clear of Parliamentary control. There was a striking instance in regard to Osborne College, where the Government came to Parliament with a total Estimate, saying that it was going to cost £40,000. That expenditure was increased by Treasury sanction to £160,000, and now the Civil Lord was asking for another £20,000 for the hospital. Similar changes of policy had occurred in connection with works at Chatham. As pointed out by a memorial of the corporation, large expenditure was incurred in regard to plans for a basin and dock area of 65 acres, after which the Admiralty decided to abandon all the works on the ground that they were going to have a base at Rosyth. He would much prefer an old dockyard developed than a new dockyard, because the latter always meant great expense upon a number of items which did not occur in the case of an old dockyard. They had to provide a new base and then equipments. Then there was *personnel*, and finally the Admiralty generally urged the War Office to incur large expenditure on fortifications and guns. In recent years they had seen four dockyards abandoned, viz., Trincomalee, Jamaica, Halifax, and Esquimault, and in the case of three of them at any rate expenditure had been incurred up to the very last moment, and that expenditure was hastened in order to finish the contract, although they were going to be abandoned. Coaling stations had been abandoned, viz., St. Lucia, Ascension and Wei-hai-wei, and now we were undergoing disillusionment in regard to the huge expenditure at Dover. With regard to the accident to the "Duke of Edinburgh," the entrance to Dover he understood was 600 feet wide in one case and 800 feet in the other, and he could not see why the fact of another ship coming out at the same time should have driven the "Duke of Edinburgh" on to the shore, as stated in the official Answer on 25th March, when it was alleged that the "Duke of Edinburgh" had to anchor to avoid collision and the vessel drifted on shore owing to the bad holding ground. He understood that all the moorings at Dover had to be relaid, and that would take two years. If the Admiralty wanted to try a very simple test at this new naval base he would advise them to send the Channel Fleet and the Home Fleet to anchor at Dover. He was confident they would not respond to this challenge. He thought the multiplication of dockyards was a great evil, and he was of opinion that everything necessary outside the Royal dockyards could easily be provided by subsidising private enterprise. At Colombo they had obtained a magnificent dock, kept in constant practice by private work, for a lump sum of only £159,000. They might have pursued that policy by subsidising the Cape Town dock, and in that way they would have saved the expenditure at Simon's Bay. Lord Spencer, one of the best First Lords this country had ever had, said on August 10th, 1903, referring to Rosyth—

> "I do think it is a very serious matter indeed to start a new base, for my experience of having new centres is this, that directly you get a new centre, and an independent centre, you increase enormously the expenditure which has to be found. So far as I can see I should very much prefer to see almost double the amount which is supposed to be going to be spent on this new Scotch base spent on the old dockyards and the old naval bases, rather than on a new one, for the reason I have given, namely, that the moment you get a new establishment you increase the expenditure enormously."

That was his case against Rosyth and against multiplying these new dockyards. Notwithstanding the expenditure upon the dockyard at Malta it was frequently found necessary to bring war vessels from Malta to this country to be repaired. When the "Hood" lost her rudder in 1902 she was brought under convoy all the way from Malta to Plymouth. In his opinion Portsmouth, Plymouth or Chatham could deal with such matters much better than they could be dealt with at the small dockyard at Malta. There was the case of the "Dominion" which was sent to Bermuda to be repaired, and it was afterwards found necessary to send her to England to have her repairs attended to. The same thing happened in regard to the "Commonwealth"; she was patched at Gibraltar and then brought to England. He thought they could get all the patchwork done very conveniently by private enterprise. If they had encouraged private enterprise at Gibraltar they would have had the use of splendid docks there, which would have been available not only for the vessels belonging to the Navy but also for the mercantile marine, and would have cost the country a few hundred thousand pounds subsidy instead of many millions. The Civil Lord had referred to Berehaven being a base for the Atlantic Fleet, and therefore necessitating the development of a handy dockyard like Haulbowline. He distrusted the argument of having dockyards handy in the neighbourhood of possible battles. He would remind the Civil Lord that if they went to war with any nation they would have to fight one fleet and not several. In the case of the Americans or the Germans or in the case of France, they found each navy in one fleet. In his opinion it was quite possible for any of our disabled ships to sail home for repairs at a speed of from ten to twelve knots without possibility of interference from the enemy's fleet with which it had fought as they would be too much occupied with their own damaged ships. In these days of wireless telegraphy the dockyard could be easily informed, and vessels which were damaged could be towed home at twelve knots. Where the battle of Camperdown was fought was twenty hours sail from Chatham and forty-four hours from Plymouth. St. Vincent was seventeen hours from the patching station at Gibraltar and seventy-one hours from Plymouth. Trafalgar was five hours from Gibraltar and eighty-three hours from Plymouth. In the case of Wilhelmshaven Rosyth was thirty-seven and a half hours off, Sheerness twenty-two and a half hours, and Portsmouth thirty-six and a half. He did not see any reason why the Chatham dockyard should not be developed as was contemplated in the original scheme of the last Government. Most people were under the impression that Rosyth was just opposite the German coast. But as matter of fact it was one hour further away from that coast than Portsmouth. He did not see any reason why a patching dock should not be made at Hull in addition to the Hepburn dock on the Tyne, of course by private enterprise. He thought the strongest argument against the late Government's Rosyth scheme was that though it purported to be an exhaustive inquiry it took for granted the crowded state of the dockyards, and on those grounds advocated the provision of a new dockyard at Rosyth. During that inquiry it was found that at a certain date in 1900 there was a congestion of ships at the dockyards. The reason for that not being necessary now was that they had altered their policy, they had got better administration of the dockyards, and under the new policy they did not build so much in the Royal dockyards, which were thus rendered more available for the carrying out of repairs. Lord Selborne said that Rosyth was required simply because otherwise there would be no place at which to stow His Majesty's ships. That forecast had been completely falsified, because there was ample room room in the Royal dockyards, and since Lord Selborne delivered that speech they had discharged no less than 8,000 men for want of work. He did not intend to move the reduction of the Vote of which he had given notice. The Government were still staying their hands, and they would no doubt bring forward tangible proposals next year, either abandoning the scheme or making definite proposals in regard to Rosyth. The £10,000 could not be required for any known purpose, because the Government had £37,000 in hand last year to carry out all their surveys. It seemed to him that Rosyth had for the Admiralty the fatal fascination of a new toy. It was like a child who desired to have the moon. He hoped the Admiralty would not get Rosyth any more than the child would get the moon. They came forward with something at the back of their minds in regard to a project which on the face of it might appear a small one of a few millions, but which he was certain would extend to forty millions, in view of the great depth of mud they had to deal with, and the mile and a half of breakwater to be constructed. There was behind the project an immense amount of concealed expenditure of which the House had no knowledge, and therefore he hoped the Government would exercise the greatest amount of caution before embarking upon it.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said he desired to say a word about dockyard accommodation. He regretted that any Party element should be brought in on either side, because there was from the Party point of view a great deal to be said both ways, and if they dealt with such matters they would not get any "forrarder." On that occasion they should consider what the dockyard policy should be in regard to the future, and on that they might express certain definite and general opinions without committing themselves to details in regard to matters on which they could not possibly form competent opinions. They were not competent to say whether Rosyth was or was not the best place for a new base, nor could they say whether it would be possible to deal with the situation by an extension of Chatham as against a new dockyard in the north. But they could not afford to rely so much on the establishments west of Dover. The whole situation had lately changed. The question of the basing of our fleets, and the spots at which in future they were likely to be stationed, had so greatly changed in recent years that it was impossible to believe that we had sufficient establishment south-east of Dover. We had Portsmouth and Southampton, where we were spending money now on naval works; we had Portland and Devonport, and all the establishments west of Dover. He could not think that the number of docks we had now ready to accommodate our big ships were in the right places. It was necessary to look forward to the establishment of a base somewhere east of Dover and within easier reach of the North Sea, Dover being admittedly a difficult place to enter because the currents might be troublesome. He did not know that his hon. and gallant friend was justified in believing that the Board of Admiralty attached great importance to the Rosyth scheme. He had said that it exercised a fascination over the Board of Admiralty. It was impossible to allude to private conversations one had had from time to time, but he might say that he very much doubted whether the Board of Admiralty had ever seen their way very clearly as to the Rosyth scheme. The question was as to the possibility of building docks at Rosyth as against providing floating docks. That question might have been settled by recent investigations, the results of which had not been communicated to them. It was possible that the foundations were better than at one time they were supposed to be. He believed indeed that it was so, but it was not possible in the House to give a solid opinion as between the Rosyth scheme or a dock at some other spot on the east coast and the extension of Chatham. It was possible for them to indicate their views, and he thought it would be a mistake to continue to spend so much money at Portsmouth or further west instead of at some new establishment or some extension of old establishments on the east coast. His hon. and gallant friend was undoubtedly right in what he told the Committee as to the original ground for selecting Rosyth. The Cawdor Memorandum, issued by the late Government before they left office, contained the announcement of the abandonment of the Rosyth policy in connection with dockyard extension. The Cawdor Memorandum stated—

> "The saving here has been about £5,000,000 sterling."

By the documents named in a recent debate as issued on behalf of the present Board of Admiralty it was again claimed almost in the same words as those in the Cawdor Memorandum that there had been an enormous saving owing to the scrapping policy in regard to the number of our ships. The original ground given for Rosyth at the time of the purchase had been abandoned. The Party issue of the question and the high price at which the land was bought were discussed over and over again in the last Parliament. All those questions should be put aside and they should consider what was best, with the guidance they could obtain, for the future accommodation of the fleet and especially the big cruisers which were to be built. To contemplate the docking of ships only at Keyham and Portsmouth seemed to him to be a dangerous policy, especially when they considered what the state of of the Channel would be in time of war.

Whether the Hague Conference prohibited the use of floating mines or not, they certainly would be used, and, that being so, they must contemplate either the extension of Chatham or the creation of an establishment at a different part of the east coast.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): I hope the Committee will allow me to say one word on this subject, which I think is of the greatest importance in connection with our general naval policy. The right hon. Baronet rightly deprecated any Party recrimination on this matter, and I certainly, in anything I have to say, will carry out in the letter and the spirit the advice he gave us; but I may be permitted to say in regard to one class of argument used by the hon. and gallant Member for King's Lynn that I think the Committee should receive it with the greatest caution—caution amounting to suspicion. The class of argument to which I refer was this. He talked of the survey carried out and of all that had been done by Boards of Admiralty for many years past, and he pointed out, and in my opinion pointed out with perfect truth, that a great deal of money that had been spent in the last thirty years—if he had liked, he might have said sixty years or 160 years—had been money which, owing to subsequent developments of naval policy and changes in strategical problems, might with advantage have been otherwise spent. That is quite true, and it will always be quite true, if we try, as I hope we will, to do our duty to the best of our ability and keep up the naval strategic position of this country at the level at which it ought to be kept. You cannot expect greater wisdom or foresight on the part of the Board of Admiralty than you have from the ablest managers of great business and manufacturing firms. What manufacturing firm dealing with matters in which there is great development and invention, great change of markets, and great alterations in the condition of markets, has not got to "scrap" much of its plant? It is no answer to say that if they could have foreseen what would take place they would have adopted a different policy. It is not the fault of this Board of Admiralty, or of its predecessor, or again of its predecessor; it is the fault of poor human nature which is gifted with imperfect powers of foresight whether they are exercised on the great national problems of defence or on the smaller, but still important, questions of manufacturing and commercial enterprise. We have to accept these facts as we find them. It was relatively easy to deal with the situation in earlier generations in which the development of the old wooden battleships and old guns was so slow that it really hardly existed. I imagine that the change between the ships with which Hawke won his victory and Nelson won his was relatively insignificant. But we live in different times and different circumstances. Invention is rapid; changes in the type of ship and armament are speedy and are constantly going on; and the very fact that we live in these times makes it inevitable that we should undertake costly operations from which our forefathers were spared, and in regard to which it is impossible to say what shall be the ultimate course of events. It may be that the money we spend could be better spent if we had knowledge which we do not now possess, but which in ten or twelve years we shall possess. Therefore, I hope the Committee will try to consider each problem as it comes up on its merits, without expending useless regrets for mistakes which have been honestly made by the most competent people at the time, and which, I suppose, their equally competent successors will honestly make in the future. May I do my best to reinforce what has been said by the right hon. Baronet who has just sat down? Owing to the great changes and reforms which enabled us to dispense with a very large number of ships, the difficulties of the problem have, relatively speaking, disappeared. It is quite true that in 1902 stress was chiefly laid upon the necessity of providing berthing accommodation at Rosyth; but it must not be supposed that strategy was then absent from the mind either of the Admiralty or of the Cabinet. I remember, when I was in a more responsible position than now, discussing at great length with experts the condition in which they might anticipate the narrow seas to be in case of a first-class war. They urged that, owing to the manifold weapons of destruction which science has perfected, such as floating mines, torpedoes, torpedo destroyers, etc., the most powerful and costly of our ships might become the prey in those confined waters of a cheap and relatively insignificant opponent; and they even contemplated the necessity of diverting the whole commercial traffic of this country from the Port of London round by the north of Scotland in the case of war. It would, in these circumstances, be an impossible state of things if a ship of ours damaged in the North Sea, or on the east coast, had to pass through the Straits of Dover to Portsmouth for shelter. I do not know what the views of the present experts are in regard to Sheerness and Chatham, but undoubtedly at the time of which I speak the experts were of opinion that Rosyth would be far easier and safer of approach for a wounded vessel than was Sheerness, where there are difficulties in connection with the character of the tides and the channel. If the Admiralty and the experts have changed their views about Rosyth, it is not for me to comment upon their action. But I should like to know what they have substituted for Rosyth. If the trifling sum of £10,000 for Rosyth which appears on the Estimates is to be taken as evidence that the Government have departed from the policy of their predecessors and have abandoned Rosyth, I hope there will be forthcoming a satisfactory assurance that the Admiralty have found another place on the East coast where our great ships can be docked in case of war. In these circumstances I hope we may receive some assurance from the hon. Gentleman that this trifling and inconsiderable sum of £10,000 on the Estimates this year for Rosyth does not indicate that the Government have abandoned the policy of their predecessors in regard to Rosyth, and that if they have abandoned Rosyth they have found a substitute for it. I hope—and this is the only touch of Party criticism that anyone can find in my remarks—that the postponement in providing the new naval base at Rosyth is not due to the difficulty of finding each year the money that is required. The greatest evil that can occur is that, because the Chancellor of the Exchequer said at a given time he could not find the money, a work needed in the interest of the country must be postponed; and I trust the right hon. Gentleman will be able to give us some assurances in regard to that great national interest.

*MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that he was not there to say that Rosyth had been abandoned. The position which the Admiralty took up last year with regard to Rosyth was substantially the position of the Leader of the Opposition himself. They recognised that a naval station, of a somewhat more moderate kind than was at first proposed, was needed on the East coast. That was the main thing. In his opinion, all the indications still pointed to Rosyth as being the best place for that station. The exact position of the Admiralty in regard to Rosyth might be described in a very few words. They had put down £10,000 practically for plans as well as to enable the House to discuss the question. A sketch plan based on the scheme of the late Government had been drawn out, and was now in circulation among the members of the Board. When the final detailed plans were approved by the Government, and the cost ascertained, they would proceed in the ordinary way. It would be a long job, for, according to the best naval experts, it was a work that must be carried out with a good deal of caution.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER (Croydon) said that last year a similar statememt was made by the right hon. Gentleman. Twelve months had passed, and absolutely nothing was added either to the declaration or to the actual operations at Rosyth. Plans of an exhaustive character were drawn up three years ago. The right hon. Member might fairly say that those plans were not the plans that were going to be adopted, but that that did not involve the abandonment of Rosyth. The information in regard to the rock at the entrance to that dock, and as to buildings for establishment and for the workmen, had all been collected long ago. As the Leader of the Opposition had said, it was of enormous importance to secure some base on the East coast on which we could fall back in the event of the Channel being closed. In these circumstances the statement of the right hon. Gentleman was not very satisfactory. That, after all, was what some of them had ventured to prophecy would happen. If the Government were frightened to put on the annual Vote what was necessary for these great works they gained nothing whatever from the point of view of economy. The work was estimated to cost £3,000,000, including all the docks and the dredging; but whatever the cost might be, they would not save any money at all by carrying on the work over a series of years. Any business man would agree that economy would not result from carrying on work with a short purse, and he earnestly hoped that the temptation to make small Estimates would not be allowed to prevent this work from being carried on on what they knew were the only economical terms possible. These Estimates came up year after year, and everyone who had seen the efforts made by other Powers and knew the foresight they had displayed to provide this accommodation for themselves, must feel that we were taking a tremendous risk in allowing the matter to hang on year after year, not because there was the slightest doubt about the naval need—as the right hon. Gentleman had told the Committee the advisers of the Admiralty were clear about that three or four years ago—but because of the fear of extending the Estimates. He hoped that what they had seen this year might be replaced next year by some more active policy.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said they must all be obliged to the Secretary to the Admiralty for his statement as far as it went, but he thought that if the statement of the Civil Lord of the Admiralty had been more clear and comprehensive the debate would not have been so prolonged. The Civil Lord had informed the Committee that they were unable to proceed with the construction of the new docks at Portsmouth because they had not yet decided upon the design. Lord Tweedmouth, however, speaking in another place upon the policy of the Government said they had decided on the work which was to be done at Portsmouth. The noble Lord went on to state that the scheme was being considered and the work would probably be commenced during the present year. That statement did not agree with the statement made by the Civil Lord of the Admiralty. He would like the Civil Lord to explain, also, why it was, if they had not decided upon the design of the dockyard, that they were able to place upon the Estimates the exact sum to be spent upon it, viz., £940,000? It seemed to him that the Government were simply postponing proceedings in order to meet the demand for economy which had been made from certain quarters of the House. They knew perfectly well how much had been said by hon. Members opposite about the extravagance of the previous Government in matters of construction. Almost every Government was fearful of the charge of extravagance being levelled against them, and the strict revision of the Chancellor of the Exchequer every year had a tendency to check extravagance in any single Department. It was, however, a very easy thing for a Government which had decided on a policy of cutting down all round to say to its Departments—

> "What we want this year, next year, and the year after, is that you spend less on your Department."

In conclusion he again pressed for a clearer statement from the Civil Lord. The works at Portsmouth had been taken in hand because they were placed on the Estimates, but it was singular that there was no increase in the cost of maintenance. It showed, of course, a policy of economy, but it also showed that the Government were letting their estate run down.

Mr. E. H. LAMB (Rochester) said he had listened with intense disappointment to the statement which had been made on behalf of the Admiralty, and he was only sorry he was prevented by the action of a previous speaker from moving the reduction of the Vote by £10,000. That sum was to be used for the preparation of plans in regard to Rosyth, and in this way the House was being quietly committed to a scheme which involved an expenditure of from three to five millions. As a Party committed to a policy of economy, he thought they ought to consider for a long time before they voted this £10,000 for plans for a new naval base. He also urged that Chatham Dockyard, upon which so much money had been spent, should be improved, as well as the Medway dredged, instead of the House being committed to the large scheme at Rosyth launched by the late Government. In the case of Rosyth they knew perfectly well that an enemy could destroy it in a few hours; whereas, in the case of Chatham, as was well known, it was immune from attacks from the open sea. Surely if the Medway was efficiently dredged, we could, with very little expenditure, turn that into one of the best naval bases in the world, instead of committing the country to a vast expenditure at Rosyth when it was generally admitted that so long as we had a safe naval base on the East Coast that was as much as the Admiralty would ask for. He submitted that a case had been made out for Chatham. If the right hon. Gentleman representing the Board of Admiralty had stated that it was intended to commit the country to this great scheme at Rosyth the debate that afternoon would have been of a very different character; but instead of that the matter had been introduced in an insidious way which, unless it were watched, committed the country to a vast expenditure before they well knew what they were doing. He much regretted that by the action of his hon. friend the Member for Chatham he was prevented from moving to reduce the Vote by the total amount, because he felt that a strong protest should be made against this vast expenditure at Rosyth when a perfect naval base could be provided at Chatham at a much smaller expenditure.

*MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs) said he disagreed with every word the hon. Member had uttered so far as Rosyth was concerned. The hon. Member had pointed out that Chatham was near London; that was true, but it must also be remembered that Rosyth was not very far from Edinburgh, and if Scotland was to lose her cavalry the least the Government could do was to build her a dockyard. The hon. Member for Rochester appeared to think that Chatham was invulnerable, but he reminded the Committee that in the reign of Charles II. the Dutch took Chatham and burnt it. They had not yet got to Edinburgh. The truth was that in these piping times of peace we were rather apt to go to sleep. The argument that we should only have one fleet against us at any time was futile because there was no reason why there should not be a coalition and two or three fleets brought against us. We had to accept the possibility of disaster in this matter, to look at things at their worst, and believe that the worst might happen, and then and only then should we overcome the difficulties. He did not believe that in the whole of Scotland a better place could have been found for a dock than Rosyth, where at the present time he believed there were nine men at work. He did not know how many hundreds of years it would take those men to complete it, but he hoped the Government would provide them with old age pensions at the finish. He thought it would be a world of pities if the Government, having abandoned Trincomali, Halifax, Jamaica, Esquimault and other places, were also to abandon Rosyth.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) desired to raise the question of the granite used in the dockyards. Some three or four years ago the House of Commons passed the Fair Wages Resolution, and last year he put some Questions to the Government as to the granite used in the building of docks and harbours, and it was not then denied that the Government contractor for the Navy obtained a considerable amount of granite for use at Keyham Harbour from Norway. The Government contractor said he got his granite from Norway because it was much cheaper, owing to the Norwegian working for half the wages laid down by the British trade union. It was only a very short time ago that the district of Penrhyn, Cornwall, petitioned the Government to employ only British stone for the erection of British harbours, because 75 per cent. of the population there were out of work owing to foreign competition. He desired to know whether the Government intended to continue obtaining granite from abroad, or whether they would in future obtain it from this country. It was a question that closely affected his constituency, and he would very much like to know what was to be the future policy of the Admiralty with regard to it.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) said there were two questions upon which information was required. With regard to Portsmouth they had succeeded in obtaining a dock sufficiently commodious to take in the "Dreadnought" or the "Invincible." That dock had two entrances, one of which was too narrow for the "Dreadnought" and the other too short. It was obvious, therefore, that something must be done to enlarge those entrances, and the soone it was done the better. He noticed from the statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty that plans had been secured, and that work was to be proceeded with this year, but the Civil Lord in his speech that afternoon had stated that two sets of plans were before the Admiralty, and that there was considerable difference of opinion as to which should be adopted, with a consequence that the work was being postponed. From the east coast there was no dock capable of taking the "Dreadnought" nearer than Devonport, save the dock at Portsmouth, and the neglect to enlarge those entrances in order to make the dock available for that class of ship was a matter which called for very serious comment. The Committee were entitled to urge the Admiralty to make that dock available at the earliest possible moment. The other point requiring attention related to Rosyth, and he did not think the Government could blame the Committee for the difficulty they found in understanding the Government plans. They found in the Estimates that £10,000 was the amount to be devoted in the current year to this purpose, but there were no details as to how that money was to be expended. They were grateful to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dundee, who, in reply to the Leader of the Opposition, informed the Committee that the Government were alive to the fact that it was necessary to have an important establishment on the East Coast, because, as he pointed out, the Narrow Seas might be rendered impassable in times of war by mines or other means, and in order that the fleet might be available it might have to sail right round the North of Scotland. Referring to page 139 on the same Vote, he found that £1,892 was being spent in paying the salaries of one superintendent, one superintendent engineer, one assistant surveyor, one assistant civil engineer, two draftsmen, one accountant and one foreman. An hon. Member had said that he believed eight or nine men were working at Rosyth. If that were so they had these eight eminent gentleman to superintend nine men who were carrying on the work. He found from the footnote on page 139 that the leader of these men was to receive extra pay.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the reduction was on item B, and item A could not be referred to.

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD said he was simply endeavouring to show the nature of the work that was being done at Rosyth by referring to the people who were being employed there. There was nothing definite as to what was being done there, and he found from the official memorandum of the progress of the work that £200,000 had already been voted and had been reduced to £165,000. That £165,000 had been laid out on land, etc. Arrangements had been made with county councils, at an expense of £10,000, to supply Rosyth with water. Then arrangements had been made with the North British Railway Company to supply railway accommodation. Therefore it was neither upon land nor upon railways that this money was to be spent. Again, £10,000 was to be spent upon borings and putting down a cylinder to find out the nature of the foundations, and it was for that purpose that this army of skilled gentlemen on extra pay were being kept. Then they were told in the official paper that the work was complete; but if, as they were told, the work was in progress, it could not be complete. What he submitted was that a little reasonable information as to the money they were going to spend and the purposes on which they were going to spend it would have saved a large amount of the debate. He hoped that the Civil Lord of the Admiralty would deal with the application of the £10,000 and also let them know what was going to be done with regard to the lock at Portsmouth, so that they might have some assurance as to when the work would be begun.

MR. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent) asked, in regard to the works at Portsmouth, whether the fair-wage clause was to be inserted in the contract, or whether it would be clearly indicated to the contractors that they would be expected to pay a similar wage to that which was received by workmen in the locality. When the last new dock was made at Portsmouth the men were paid 1½d. per hour less than the local rates, in spite of the fact that the contractor had signed the fair-wage clause. Digging a dock was entirely different from digging a place for a gasometer or anything of that description. Dock making was not a common thing, and therefore he hoped that the contractors would not be allowed to be under any mistake when they were tendering with regard to the fair-wage clause. With regard to Rosyth, he would like to know whether the Admiralty had any idea at the time the Estimates were made that it would be necessary to sink about 200 feet in order to find firm foundations, and what was now their opinion, in view of the tests and examination made by experts, of the site. Were the Estimates made on the part of the Admiralty the same now as they were prior to the soundings and the examination of the site which had taken place.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.) asked what was going to be done with regard to the entrance to Portsmouth Harbour. He had been down there once or twice, and he had seen a dredger at work in Haslar Creek. Was that work being done to widen the entrance to Portsmouth Harbour so as to avoid the danger which existed at the present time in certain states of the wind?

SIR F. BANBURY asked for some explanation of the item in regard to the factory at Portsmouth, the total estimate for which was £120,000. On looking at the Estimate he found that the cost was reduced from £188,000 to £125,000, increased to £127,000, and was now reduced to £120,000. It seemed a curious way of arriving at an estimate, and it would be more satisfactory if the Civil Lord gave some explanation.

MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) said the plans for Rosyth were prepared under the previous Government, and they were of an elaborate character involving a large expenditure. Were those plans to be entirely abandoned, and did the present Admiralty treat the subject from an entirely different point of view? Was it not a fact that they had come under some grave obligations to the county councils with regard to water schemes? Generally speaking, people who had incurred expense in connection with these works would like to know how far what was originally intended was to be carried out, or what plans were to be adopted.

*MR. LAMBERT said that the total estimate for the steam factory at Portsmouth was £120,000. The sum of £116,700 had been expended, and this year another £3,300 was being provided, and that brought the amount up to £120,000. In all engineering works it was quite impossible to know two or three years before the works were commenced exactly what they were going to cost. In reply to the hon. Member for Stoke he might say that the fair wages clause would be inserted in all contracts.

MR. J. WARD asked whether "fair wages" meant the rate of wages paid in the district for a similar class of work.

*MR. LAMBERT said fair wages meant the wages current in the district. If whilst the work was proceeding, the hon. Member would bring to his attention any attempted evasion of the fair wages clause, the Admiralty would at once remedy it. His right hon. friend had already dealt with the question of Rosyth, and he did not propose to say another word about that. As to Portsmouth lock, the late Civil Lord had taunted the Government with being responsible for great delay. The word used by the hon. Member was "scandalous." He did not complain of his epithets. In these matters he wished to impress upon the Committee the absolute necessity of circumspection and ample consideration. They were going to spend a large sum of money. The hon. Member for Gravesend had asked why they had put in the total estimate. They had put in the same total of £940,000 as was in the Vote last year. In reality, he did not think that was a very business-like proceeding, but they were forced to put in the total estimate because if they did not they could not accept a contract. Now they could let a contract up to £940,000, but unless they put in the total it could not be done. He agreed that was not business-like, because it showed the contractor what their estimate for the work was, but those were the rules of the House of Commons. The Government had called in an outside firm of engineers. He did not suppose there was any person in the House who had to spend upwards of a million of money, but would give to the subject the utmost consideration and obtain the best possible advice. If illustrations of the importance of circumspection were needed, they were to be seen in what had happened during the last ten years under the Loan Act. At Gibraltar, for instance, two docks had been built under loans which would not be paid off for thirty years, and one of them would not dock the "Invincible"; and at Malta two docks had been built under similar loans with the same result. The Bermuda dock would not take the "Invincible," and the same remark applied to the permanent dock at Hong Kong. Then there was the case of the dock at Chatham. That dock was built at a cost of £450,000, and it actually would not take the "Dreadnought."

MR. JENKINS: There must have been a blunder somewhere.

*MR. LAMBERT said they could not be blamed for that. They were expecting a report from an eminent firm of engineers expressing their opinion upon Portsmouth dock. The hon. Member for Blackpool had asked some questions about the accident to the "Duke of Edinburgh." That vessel came into Dover harbour perfectly right, but unfortunately her anchors did not hold, and there was accordingly a slight mishap. The accident had nothing to do with the entrance to the harbour. The Admiralty had gone very carefully into the question of width. It has been decided to make the western entrance 740 feet wide, which it was hoped would be sufficient for any battleship. The hon. Member for Chatham had asked a Question about the £3,000 for a dry dock at Chatham.

MR. JENKINS: Would that be able to take the "Dreadnought?"

*MR. LAMBERT said it would not. The estimated expenditure at Simon's Bay had been reduced from £3,500,000 to £3,100,000. The estimate was made a long time ago, and it was not always possible to foresee exactly what the expenditure would be. The Government hoped to reduce somewhat the expenditure at Simon's Bay as the result of the redistribution of the Fleet. The new scheme concentrated the vast preponderance of our naval strength around our own shores, and the South African Squadron had been largely reduced. It was also hoped to reduce the scale of equipment contemplated for the dock, though the basin itself would remain unaltered. He appealed to the Committee to allow the Vote to pass in order that they might get on with those works.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE said the Opposition would support the Amendment as a protest against the delay of the Government in proceeding with Rosyth. The reduction of the hon. Member for Chatham was moved for the whole of the new works, but it might be supported from different motives. The motive which would animate him, and he hoped his friends, would be in regard to Rosyth. When this Amendment was out of the way he hoped the hon. Gentleman would be in a position to answer a number of Questions with regard to other items on the Vote.

MR. JENKINS asked the hon. Gentleman to state the policy of the Admiralty with regard to the provision of dry dock accommodation. He had moved his Amendment solely on the ground that in his opinion there should be dry dock accommodation sufficiently large at every base throughout the country.

*MR. BELLAIRS said it would be most unfortunate if, as the result of the criticisms repeatedly made, the impression should go forth that there was no dock accommodation on the east coast for such vessels as the "Dreadnought." That was not correct.

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 66; Noes, 271. (Division List No. 143).

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart

Boyle, Sir Edward
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craik, Sir Henry
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Jenkins and Mr. Thorne.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Boland, John
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Cheshire
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Clark, George Smith (Belfast, N.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Duncan, J. H. (York, Otley)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hall, Frederick
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N. E.
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kilbride, Denis
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)

M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morrell, Philip
Murnaghan, George
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connon, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Perks, Robert William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)

Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Stanger, H. Y.
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)

Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walsh, Stephen
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

Original question again proposed.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he wished to ask his hon. friend a Question in regard to the Item O, regarding the sale of stores and land in connection with the abolition of submarine mining. It was difficult to see why the Admiralty should abolish submarine mining in commercial ports. He understood that the submarine mining plant had been sold and the proceeds had been credited to the Naval Estimates; and it was rumoured that the Admiralty had attempted to sell the land on which the Brennan torpedo installations stood. He asked whether the Appropriations-in-Aid of the present year contained the price of any land sold which was connected with torpedo work?

MR. ASHLEY asked if any provision had been made at foreign Naval stations for the repairs of turbine machinery, with which, he understood, all the new warships were being fitted. The machinery for the repair of ordinary engines was absolutely useless for the repair of turbine engines.

SIR F. BANBURY said that the Vote for the new steam factory at Portsmouth had been reduced from £188,000 to £120,000 and it was explained that that was on account of engineering difficulties. But that was a very unsatisfactory reply. They all knew perfectly well that there was no branch of work which was more difficult to estimate than engineering work. This, however, was not an engineering work, but a steam factory. How could the hon. Gentleman say that the building of a steam factory was an engineering work? The only conclusion that he could arrive at was that the hon. Gentleman gave the first answer that came into his head. Then there was the question of the expenditure of £20,000 on a new lock at Portsmouth. The hon. Gentleman had said that they must proceed cautiously because it would take thirty years from now before the cost of the works could be covered. But it was no answer to the criticisms which had been offered to say that the people who were responsible for the original estimates were wrong; that they were badly prepared; and that they would not achieve what was desired. The hon. Gentleman ought to be in a position to say that he would look into the matter and see that the original policy was carried out. They were not now discussing as to how the money was to be obtained for these new works; but whether it was necessary to have proper docks in different parts of the world able to take the largest vessels in the Navy. The science of shipbuilding was progressing rapidly, and there must be a wastage of capital in regard to dock-building, but that would have to be faced. The docks already built were not sufficiently large to admit the newest ships. As to the question of loans, why should this generation bear all the burdens of posterity? What they were doing now was for the good of posterity and posterity should bear some part of the burden. Then there was a large decrease for the works at Simon's Bay, which also the hon. Gentleman attributed to the difficulty of making proper engineering estimates. The hon. Gentleman had said that there was a reduction of facilities. His contention was that there should not be a reduction of facilities and that the preparation of stations for the Navy was the most vital of all questions. He trusted the hon. Gentleman would be guided solely by the necessity of providing proper and efficient naval bases in all parts of the world. Without that, all the money spent on the Navy was wasted. It was absolutely essential that we should have proper bases at at home and abroad. As he understood the contention of the hon. Gentleman below the gangway, it was that they could not get ships of the class of the "Dreadnought" into Chatham dockyard in consequence of the condition of the River Medway, and one of the great items of expenditure in regard to docks of that class was dredging, not because of the actual cost of the operation but because the river was constantly silting up and the work had to be done over and over again. Therefore he thought that the dredging of a river was not a satisfactory solution, because it was not a permanent one. The arguments advanced against the desire of the Opposition to see proper accommodation provided were most unsatisfactory, and disclosed no reason whatever for the policy of the Government. He hoped that before the Report stage the right hon. Gentlemen would reconsider his policy, and would assure the House that he really was anxious to provide proper facilities for the repair of these vessels, and that he would do so irrespective of any errors that might have been made in the past and of the amount of money it might cost. In saying that he hoped he would not be misunderstood. An hon. Member had said it would be very easy to wander over the face of the globe and place a station here and a station there. That was not what he advocated. All he wanted was that the plans in regard to stations already adopted should be completed in the best possible manner and as soon as possible.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said he could assure hon. Members that all proper facilities would be given for further discussion and appealed to the Committee to allow the Government now to obtain this Vote. The hon. Gentleman opposite knew perfectly well that there were special reasons why Vote 10 should be taken early. If they obtained that Vote others to which exception might be taken could be postponed.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE agreed that Vote 10 must be got through early, although there were some very important questions which he was anxious to raise upon it, and he would not get another opportunity of doing so this session. The right hon. Gentleman was anxious to get the Vote before a quarter past eight, and he did not want to prevent that by any undue discussion. He would like to know, however, why an item of £10,000 for a groyne at Hooness, near Chatham, had been struck out of the Vote this year. He considered that that work was absolutely essential to prevent the lock entrances to Chatham dockyard from being silted up, which would prevent any vessel entering except one drawing a very moderate amount of water. He noticed also that the sum for repairs and maintenance had not been increased, although a large amount of extra new works had been lately handed over to the naval authorities. He would have thought that that being the case the amount for repairs and maintenance would have been proportionately increased. It had been the custom, moreover, to place at the disposal of Admirals and Admiral Superintendents at the ports a sum of money to enable them to carry out small works without special Parliamentary sanction. It had been always found that that was a most economical method, and that the Admirals had put the money to the best use. He hoped that the reduction in the Vote, under that head, did not mean that the fund which was handed to the Admirals was to be in any way reduced.

*MR. LAMBERT said that their advisors had asked for the amounts which were now being voted. Next year there would have to be an increase of the Vote for maintenance. There was no intention of departing from the system of allowances to Admirals.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE: There is a large reduction in the sub-head of the Vote.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

2. £837,900, Half-pay, Reserved, and Retired Pay.

Motion made, and Question proposed—"That a sum, not exceeding £1,302,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the expenses of Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908."

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

3. £370,900, Civil Pensions and Gratuities.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY (SUPERANNUATION FUND) BILL (BY ORDER).

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

CHANNEL TUNNEL RAILWAY BILL.
(BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

*SIR WILLIAM HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham) said on behalf of the promoters that the prospects of the measure were so seriously impaired by the hostile attitude of the Government that under the circumstances the conclusion they had come to was that it was better not to proceed further at present. He was, however, authorised to say that the promoters regretted they had been denied the opportunity of laying their case fully before a competent Parliamentary Committee in order to demonstrate the enormous advantage that would accrue from their proposal, and also its absolute freedom from risk. The promoters were convinced that if this measure had been sent to a Committee they would have been able to show the most sceptical that substantial trade advantages would have inevitably ensued from the more rapid transit of goods and the diminished amount of handling required. It was very long since that important question had been gone into. Much had transpired in the interval, and in the opinion of the promoters the time was ripe for further consideration of the subject. A quarter of a century had elapsed since it came up before a Parliamentary Committee, when it was rejected by a majority of one. But the world had moved on since then. Engineering science had made great strides. The requirements of a growing population had increased. And happily the walls of jealousy between the two nations had been lowered. But they had to deal with facts as they found them. And he, for one, must admit that he hardly remembered a Bill which had aroused such keen susceptibilities as this. Feelings of that kind, however, when honestly entertained, were entitled to careful and respectful consideration. Under the circumstances it would have been folly for the promoters to have attempted to force the Bill through the House at the present time. They must wait until the public mind was less sensitive on the subject. They quite recognised that there was a large body of opinion which was jealous lest a finger should be lifted to weaken the defences of this country, and with that body of opinion he himself was in the most hearty agreement and sympathy. There was absolutely no difference of opinion whatever between the promoters of the Bill and its opponents as to the question of national safety. That was a question of paramount importance. The promoters firmly believed that if the Bill had been sent to a Committee upstairs the national safety would have been proved to be absolutely safeguarded down to the minutest details. What the promoters wanted was that the question should have been calmly and dispassionately considered, on its merits—neither rushing it through hurriedly on the one hand, nor rejecting it unceremoniously on the other—and if it was found that the good outweighed the evil the Bill should be allowed to pass. If, on the other hand, it was found that the evil outweighed the good then its promoters would have joined hands with the opponents of the measure and refused to go forward another step. He begged to move that the order be discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order be discharged and the Bill withdrawn."

Mr. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth) said he thought no other course was open to the promoters. Many years ago it was his fortune to be closely associated with this very important international project. More than thirty years ago he was engaged by the Channel Tunnel Company of those days to endeavour to help to pass the Bill through Parliament, and it was then only rejected by a majority of five to four in the Select Committee of the House. He would remind the promoters of the Bill that the necessity for this great work was not so great to-day as it was thirty years ago. One reason was that there had been an enormous growth in the cross-Channel traffic, owing to the large size of the steamers and the more rapid handling of passengers. He thought the Government had been very well advised in indicating at a very early stage their views on the project. It was a remarkable thing that the cost of the project to-day was estimated to be just twice as much as it was twenty-five years ago. It was now £16,000,000 as against £8,000,000 at that time. The project was certainly of a prodigious nature, and he very greatly doubted whether the cross-Channel traffic justified it. When the Bill was before the House previously it was thrown out for precisely the same reasons as those advanced at present. It had been said that the construction of the tunnel would promote still more friendly relations between the French and ourselves, but it did not always follow that the friendship of people or of nations was always promoted by too close contact. He had been a shareholder in the company for twenty-five years, but since the country was strongly against the enterprise, and since it would have the effect of involving us in possibly vast military expenditure, he did not think the commercial advantages it would afford would justify it. He therefore thought the promoters had been well advised in withdrawing the Bill.

Mr. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford) said he was in favour of the tunnel, which would have promoted the trade of this country, and afforded an easy means of getting into the delightful country of France. He could not but remember the words of John Bright, that this country undertook to rule half the world, to dominate in the east and in the west, and yet it could not defend a rat-hole in its own territory. For his part he paid not the slightest attention to the alarmist Jingoes, who would spend all the money they could get, tunnel or no tunnel. When this Bill was brought forward nearly thirty years ago it was very nearly carried. We had increased since then, and had become immensely more powerful in every respect, yet the Bill did not get a look in. Judging by that experience, thirty years hence, when no doubt we should be still more powerful, nobody would ever dare to promote a Bill, because presumably we should be more nervous than we were now. That was international cowardice. Why should they give way to the Jingoes? Did they think that the Germans were going to smash our Fleet, and that the French were going to rush through the tunnel? Why, if the Germans smashed our Fleet the French would come to our aid through the tunnel. Opponents of the Bill would prevent that being done by hindering the construction of the tunnel. It was matter of great regret that His Majesty's Government, whom he entirely respected in every way, had not been a little courageous and assisted the Bill. It would have been a great honour and credit to them if they had helped this country to shake hands with France.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill withdrawn.

LONDON AND NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY BILL. (By Order.)

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [19th March], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

> "To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, and add the words 'no Bill can be satisfactory to this House which confers increased powers on a railway company created by Act of Parliament which has subscribed out of its corporate funds to a Party organisation.'"—(*Mr. Trevelyan.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs) said he desired to say one word on this question, though he could speak only by leave of the House. On the last occasion when the matter was discussed, the debate was adjourned rather in order to afford an opportunity for the representatives of the railway companies to make some statement which would reassure the House as to the future policy of these great statutory corporations. He was sorry to say that no assurance of that kind had been forthcoming. He was afraid that there was not sufficient unity amongst them with regard to the course which they proposed to follow. He very much regretted that the clear and emphatic statements made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Epping Division and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin had not been adopted by other railway directors; but unfortunately they had not been able to agree, and there was now no satisfactory declaration on behalf of the railway companies. The only information they had when they debated the matter on the previous occasion was that one railway company—namely, the London and North-Western Company—had subscribed to the funds of a political organisation. Since then three or four other companies had owned up; and there was good reason to believe that they were only samples out of many. In fact, from information received, he was justified in believing that it had been almost a general practice. That made it really very serious, and the Government had come to the conclusion that they must deal with the matter as a whole. It was perfectly clear that they could not discuss questions of this kind on the merits of each individual private Bill, because that was unfair not merely to the Bill, but to the railway companies and to the general public, as most of the Bills were for the purpose of increasing the travelling facilities of the public. In regard to this particular Bill it was in part promoted, as the result of pressure brought by the Board of Trade, to increase the facilities for workmen to travel at cheap rates. It seemed hard that because the company had done something which, in the judgment of hon. Members, corporations with statutory powers ought not to do, therefore these workmen should be punished by the curtailing of their facilities for travelling. He had, therefore, found it necessary, in order really to help railway companies to get good Bills through the House, to face the general question. He proposed, on behalf of the Government, in so far as they had powers—and they had very considerable powers in the Board of Trade in this respect—so to alter the schedules of the accounts furnished by railway and statutory companies to the Board of Trade as to force them to disclose, at any rate, subscriptions of this kind. He did not suppose the railway companies would object to that. It was fair that the shareholders should know, because they were not all of one mind. He did not think they were all Moderates. No doubt there were some who held fair and intelligent views. He had no doubt that a very fair proportion of the shareholders would object to such contributions; at any rate they ought to be given an opportunity of objecting. Such subscriptions ought not to be included in "general sundries" or "miscellaneous services;" the shareholders ought to know of them. That was as far as they could go with their present powers. But it would be open to the railway companies to say, "Yes, we have subscribed to these associations, but we stand by those subscriptions and defend them." It would then be for the House to deal with that situation. In the United States of America last year they passed a very drastic Bill to deal with circumstances of a similar character. That Bill forbade statutory corporations to make any money contribution towards political objects in connection with any election to any political office. It covered the whole ground as regarded statutory companies, and prohibited the interference of limited liability companies in any kind of political contest. He did not think they ought to legislate in advance of proved grievances, and for the present he did not think that any kind of case was made out against limited liability companies. What the Government now proposed was this. They proposed to introduce a Bill for the purpose of forbidding statutory corporations to make contributions out of their funds towards political contests. Of course, he could give no pledge with regard to the time when it would be introduced. They had a few things to deal with this year already, and he was afraid the deliberations upon them were likely to be rather prolonged. He trusted his hon. friends would consider that to be satisfactory. [Cries of "No."] He thought it would be a very serious thing if they did not, and he asked his hon. friends on that side of the House to pause. He did not think it was fair that they should prevent a Bill going through which would have the effect of increasing railway facilities for a good many districts—facilities demanded by the general public, and which the railway companies were seeking to give as a result of the demand of the general public. He would go further, and say it was not to the interest—he would not say of the general public, but he would put it on Party ground and say it was not in the interest of the Liberal Party—to put obstacles in the way of legitimate expenditure to develop the resources of the country. He earnestly trusted that his hon. friend would see his way to withdraw the Amendment, and in any event he himself would support the Second Reading of the Bill.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) said he desired to make a personal statement on a subject that affected his personal credit in the House. He recalled that when this Bill was under the consideration of the House on the last occasion he stated that the London and North-Western Railway Company had never subscribed a shilling to any political fund, and that the hon. Member for Denbigh District, challenging that statement, alleged that the directors had subscribed to the funds of the Free Labour Association for the purpose of securing contracting-out of the Employers' Liability Bill of 1883. In contradicting the statement he then made he did not think for a moment that the hon. Member would say that he was purposely deceiving the House.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS (Denbigh District): Hear, hear.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD said he took it at the time that the hon. Member thought he had made a statement which was unsupported by evidence. Since then the officials of the company had at his request made the most thorough and searching examination of the whole of the company's payments from 1883 to 1903 inclusive, and that investigation had failed to disclose any such payment, either direct or indirect, as that alleged by the hon. Member for Denbigh District. He was not satisfied even with that, and a further search was made for all the payments of £25 and twenty-five guineas to make sure that no such payment had been made in any indirect manner, but the result was the same. He asserted, without fear of contradiction, that there was not a shadow of foundation for the suggestion made in a newspaper, which, he hoped, was the only foundation for the hon. Member's statement, that the directors of the London and North-Western had ever subscribed, directly or indirectly, to the funds of the association in question. He hoped the hon. Member might now see his way to withdraw a remark made, he had no doubt, under a misapprehension.

MR. CLEMENT EDWARDS said that whatever he stated in the House on a previous occasion was not in the least degree intended to reflect upon the credibility of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. It often happened that Members were called upon in the House to make statements concerning facts which were not within their own personal knowledge. He took that to be the position with regard to the statement of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. That was the position in which he himself was placed, and when he was given certain information he thought it his duty to make the most careful and exhaustive inquiry into the evidence upon which his statement was based. He made such an inquiry in this case and a great mass of evidence was placed before him. As the result of those inquiries he came to the conclusion that the evidence as to the accuracy of his statement was overwhelming. He had instituted inquiries with the view of tracing the whereabouts of the man who was secretary of the Free Labour Association at the time when this contribution was alleged to have been made, and he had a sworn statement dated 6th April, 1907, from that person, John Sennett, stevedore, which he proposed to read to the House. The statement was as follows—

> "I, John Sennett, 78, Cathay Street, Union Road, Rotherhithe, stevedore, make oath and say as follows:—
>
> "1. On or about June 22nd, 1892, at the instigation of Mr. G. A. Laws of the Shipping Federation I formed the Free Labour Association with offices in Myrdle Street, Commercial Road, E. The said Mr. Laws gave me £40 to float the association. I at once issued in the name of the Free Labour Association a manifesto throughout London denouncing trade unionism and the Liberal Party, and urging the London workmen to support the Conservative Party. The Association at this time, consisted of seven Committee men, a chairman, and myself as secretary and treasurer.
>
> "2. My colleagues and myself at once proceeded to collect subscriptions from anti-trade union employers, Conservative candidates and the Conservative headquarters. The Conservative headquarters paid me £50 before, and £100 immediately after the 1892 election. The £50 was paid me by Mr. Rowbotham and the £100 by Captain Middleton.
>
> "3. When the Liberal Government introduced their Employers Liability Bill the Free Labour Association at once started an agitation in favour of 'contracting out.' The London and North Western Railway Company, it will be remembered, took a leading part in the agitation for 'contracting out' so as to preserve their insurance society. We called a conference on the subject, at which Mr. W. Ellis, an official of the London and North Western Railway Company attended as representing the London and North Western Railway Insurance Society.
>
> "4. Towards the expenses of this conference and agitation the London and North Western Railway Company contributed the sum of £25 to our funds. The sum was paid through Mr. Ellis, the said official of the London and North Western Railway Company, who almost immediately afterwards became an official of the said Free Labour Association. I myself had part of the said £25 in part payment of my expenses for advocating that the London and North Western Railway Company should be allowed to contract their men out of the Employers Liability Act if it became law, so as to preserve their insurance society.
>
> "5. A number of the 'contracting out employers contributed to our funds at the same time, and it was upon this money that we ran the agitation in favour of 'contracting out.'
>
> "6. If the London and North Western Railway Company had not so contributed we should not have allowed their official to attend our conference, nor should we have run the agitation in favour of their insurance society as in fact we did by letters, manifestoes, meetings and resolutions.
>
> "Sworn at No. 10, Bell Yard, Fleet Street, in the City of London this 6th day of April, 1907.—Before me,
>
> (*Signed*) J. H. HOPE.
> *A Commissioner for Oaths.*
> (*Signed*) JOHN SENNETT.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: I adhere to every word I have said, and I would ask the hon. Member, if he does not see fit to withdraw the allegation in the House, to repeat the allegation outside the House.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said he wished to say a few words in answer to the appeal which had been made to him to withdraw his Motion. The House would recollect that the two main reasons he gave in its support, and which appeared to meet with the approval of the House, were, first, that the company ought to give back the money it had subscribed out of the funds belonging to the shareholders and repay it into the funds of the company; secondly, that he would not withdraw his Motion unless he felt that there was some security against any repetition of this conduct by the company in question. The House would recollect the speech in which the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Epping stated that the company had given back the subscription and considered that they had made a mistake in giving it. He did not think that the majority of the House were satisfied that that was sufficient security against a repetition of the conduct. To-night a statement had been made by the President of the Board of Trade, who had stated that the Government, with the powers they already possessed, would insist upon publicity being given to all subscriptions of this kind by all railway companies. The right hon. Gentleman had also promised that the Government would introduce legislation in order to make it absolutely illegal that such subscriptions should be given. It might be objected that the right hon. Gentleman had not promised to introduce legislation on the question this year. He was satisfied, however, with the promise, because there were no elections imminent. That being so, he thought they might safely anticipate that the right hon. Gentleman would carry out his intention next year of passing what would necessarily be a very short Bill. Under these circumstances he believed that in the right hon. Gentleman's promise they had got security against a repetition of any such conduct by the railway companies as that on which the House felt so strongly, and as far as he was concerned, he would be ready to withdraw the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

*Mr. LEA (St. Pancras, E.) said that there were a large number of London and North-Western employees in his constituency; and in competing for their votes the Conservative and Moderate candidates at the general election and County Council election respectively had several privileges given to them. He would like to recall to the House what had been the policy of this railway company for many years. A few weeks ago, when this question was brought before the House, the right hon. and gallant Member for the Epping Division stated that the company was unaware that the Municipal Reform League was a political organisation.

Colonel LOCKWOOD: I said we had reason to believe it was not.

*Mr. LEA said that one of the directors of the company was a Moderate candidate for Haggerston, and facts had subsequently come out to show that he knew what the objects of the Municipal Reform League were. This was not an isolated case. At every Parliamentary and County Council election in East St. Pancras the Conservative and Moderate candidates had been favoured by the company. In the first place the men had been summoned to Euston to hear addresses from these candidates, while similar opportunities had been denied to the candidates on the other side. Some official, too, supplied the favoured candidates with the names and addresses of all the railway servants in the constituency, so that the men were made the recipients of letters and circulars pointing out the serious effect of increased rates on wages and employment. The following circular, signed by Messrs. Barnes & Organ, and addressed from the offices of the East St. Pancras Conservative Association, was sent out during the recent County Council election—

Rates and Wages of Railway Servants.
Private and Confidential.

18, Camden Street, N.W.
13th February, 1907.

"Dear Sir,—May we venture to call your attention to the importance of the coming London County Council Election to you as a railway employee. It is of the utmost consequence to you that the present rate in London should be reduced.

"The rates and taxes paid by the railway companies in various parts of the Kingdom amounted, in 1905, to nearly £5,000,000, and represented an increase during the past nine years of nearly £2,000,000.

"The last official Returns show that the largest increase in the cost per train-mile in the year 1905 is in respect of rates and taxes.

The effect of such increase in rates on the railway companies is to retard an advance in wages and not merely this, but to seriously impede railway development throughout the country, thus tending to reduce the employment which the railway companies would otherwise be providing.

"*Lloyd's Weekly* recently called attention to the persistent rumour that the Great Eastern Railway contemplate moving their locomotive works to Ipswich, owing to the burden of the rates. The railway companies in London are equally experiencing the baneful effect of Progressive rates, which, if not reduced, must

> ultimately re-act to the detriment of all railway servants living in and around London.
>
> "The Municipal Reform Party is pledged to a policy of economy with efficiency, and to actively advancing the social welfare of the industrial working classes.
>
> "For this, and for other reasons, we trust we may be favoured with your support at the coming London County Council Elections.
>
> We are, dear Sir,
> Yours faithfully,
> EDMUND BARNES.
> T. A. ORGAN."

When this question was last before the House he had no opportunity of stating these facts, and he spoke to the right hon. and gallant Member for the Epping Division outside. He felt perfectly convinced after what the House had heard from the right hon. and gallant Member, that action of the kind described would not continue in future if he could prevent it. But what he himself and his constituents had to think of was what was going to happen when the right hon. and gallant Member was no longer on the London and North-Western Railway Board. They had suffered for the last twenty years in this matter. He was not committing any breach of secrecy when he said that one of the Members who formerly sat for his constituency told him how it was done. Indeed it was done in his own case at the last general election. Sir Thomas Wrightson had the privilege of addressing the railway employees at Euston. When he applied for a like privilege it was denied to him. The result, so far as he was concerned, was a most happy one. He would like to know from the President of the Board of Trade what measures he proposed to adopt to prevent subscriptions of this kind being given in future. He was informed that the names of shareholders and debenture holders in railway companies were not filed at Somerset House as in the case of limited liability companies. If there was a register of names available for public inspection, one would be able to see whether on account of the political views of the shareholders there was any hanky-panky business going on. He asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he could give an assurance, apart from money contributions, that measures would be taken to make railway companies remain absolutely impartial in all political and municipal contests.

*MR. HAROLD COX (Preston) thanked the President of the Board of Trade for putting the matter in a clear light. He was quite sure that everybody would agree with the proposition the right hon. Gentleman had laid down with respect to the payment of such subcriptions, but whether he would find it so easy to introduce a Bill as he had sketched out he felt a little doubtful. While they were all agreed that it was extremely undesirable that great companies should spend money on political objects, yet when they came to deal with it in detail they would find that the principle applied not only to statutory companies, but to all companies and even to wealthy individuals. He could not see how the right hon. Gentleman was going to draw the line nor how he was going to deal with the greater evil of political pressure brought to bear by railway companies upon their servants. He entirely agreed with what had been said as to the intolerable situation that would arise if the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Elland Division were carried. It was a monstrous proposal. [Cries of "Oh!" and "Hear, hear!"] It amounted to this, that because a railway company came to Parliament with a scheme which no one denied was one of public interest, therefore the House of Commons, having the company by the throat, should force it to do something which they had no legal right to ask it to do. There had been in the past many landlords with tenants who had honourably discharged all their obligations, but the landlords still were not satisfied. They went to those tenants and said, "Although you have done all we require you to do, yet because we have you by the throat we shall require you to vote the way we want you to." That was analagous to the position taken up by the hon. Member for the Elland Division. The matter should be dealt with by legislation, and not in the way proposed by the hon. Member. The mere fact that this company came to the House for fresh powers did not give the House the right to force upon them what his hon. friend proposed. [AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, it does.] Let him look at the matter a little more deeply. What happened when they granted powers to a railway company? They gave a monopoly on certain conditions. The company had to give certain services, and agree not to charge beyond certain maximum fares. That was a bargain. Parliament had a right to insist on that bargain. That was their "pound of flesh." They had no right to go beyond that and introduce irrelevant matters. He would remind the House that hon. Members who were appointed to Private Bill Committees had to make a declaration that they had no personal interest in the Bill. But that did not apply when the Bill was before the Whole House. He knew that his hon. friend was only acting in what he thought the public interest; but surely there was a danger of corruption if Members took advantage of their position in the House to extort concessions from railway companies. The procedure in the House, as in Private Bill Committees, should be a judicial procedure. A very important point had been raised by this discussion, and that was that railway companies and other corporations had at present no representation whatever upon local bodies. Only that morning he had received a letter from a constituent who pointed out that the company with which he was concerned, and which had been built up by his father, was very heavily rated, and yet had no representation whatever on the local authority. It was a public scandal and absolutely unjust that these great concerns should be heavily taxed and that they should have no sort of representation on the taxing body. He would remind the House that the liberties of the country and the very existence of the House of Commons depended on the principle that representation should accompany taxation, and they were virtually repudiating that principle when these great companies were taxed and denied all form of representation. He had no scheme of representation to propose. That was a difficult question; but the consideration of it was germane to the present discussion. If great corporations were taxed, he maintained that they must have some method of representation, or they would take other means of defending themselves, and it might be that they would defend themselves corruptly. It might be accepted as certain that whenever people suffered injustice they would resent and resist it

*Mr. MICKLEM (Hertfordshire, Watford) said he was not prepared to agree with the hon. Member for Preston that the railway interests were not represented in the House. He confessed that to him that was an entirely new idea. He quite agreed that the railway interests and other corporations were not directly represented in the House and also on local bodies, but they were indirectly very largely represented both in the House and on local bodies. He did not want in a measure of this kind to follow out in detail the speech of the hon. Member for St. Pancras; he wished to confine himself to the Resolution before the House. He thought the hon. Member for St. Pancras was under a misapprehension. There was no evidence whatever that the directors or officials of the London and North Western Railway had used unfairly their influence in order to obtain votes for certain candidates either for Parliament or local bodies.

Mr. LEA said that he had been told so by a man who had sat in the House for many years.

*Mr. MICKLEM said that the hon. Member had mentioned the names of two men who had sent out the circular to the employees of the London and North Western Railway Company; but he did not connect these men with the directors of that company.

Mr. LEA said that the directors of the London and North Western Railway Company had contributed to the funds of the body which sent out the circulars.

*Mr. MICKLEM said he saw no evidence of that whatever.

Mr. LEA said the circular could not have been issued to the employees of the London and North Western Railway Company unless the names and addresses of all the railway servants in the different constituencies had been supplied by the company's officials.

*Mr. MICKLEM said he imagined that no Member of the House would have the least difficulty in ascertaining the names and addresses of all the shareholders in the London and North Western Railway Company, and even of their employees. He would give his own experience. He represented a constituency in which the influence of the London and North Western Railway Company was as strong as anywhere else in England. There were large railway works in Watford, and it was becoming a most important centre for railway men near London. At his election the London and North Western Railway Company had, from first to last, put not the slightest pressure upon any man in their employment to influence his vote in the Watford Division, though there was no division near London in which the contest was more severe. He was glad to bear testimony to that fact, and he asserted that if his hon. friend would submit his document to any unprejudiced lawyer——he meant a man who could form a fair and just estimate of evidence—he would find that the conclusion he had arrived at was not fairly justified by the evidence. Probably some men had been using the name of the London and North Western Railway Company without authority. He could quite understand the general attitude of the hon. Gentleman, but he could only express to the House his experience which justified him in coming to a conclusion. He wanted to say one word about this particular Bill. It was of the utmost importance, and he might say that he himself had a very grave interest in it. He was not, however, a man of wealth, did not own any shares in the London and North Western Railway and was never likely to be a director of that or any other company.

Mr. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): You never can tell. There may be a good time coming. I will share the spoils with you.

*Mr. MICKLEM said he hoped the hon. Gentleman was a true prophet, but his interest was this. He represented a constituency which would benefit if this railway was made. Watford itself was exceedingly needy, and this was a railway which the people there had been proposing for many years in order further to develop the town. The London and North Western Railway Company had developed Watford so that it had become one of the suburbs of London, and they had there, not only very large railway but very large industrial works, and more industrial works were coming to the town every day. It was therefore essential in the interests of the community of Watford, which was becoming a great industrial centre and which was also a great residential centre, that this Bill should pass. What was the objection to the measure? He confessed that if it were a case in which the London and North Western Railway were deliberately saying "We insist upon our right to subscribe to funds which shall be devoted to political purposes and shall be used in Parliamentary or local affairs to forward the interests of one side"—although he believed this Bill was wanted for the neighbourhood, he would think that the great public interest which such a position raised would justify him in opposing the Bill, because the railway company would be adopting a line which no public body ought to take. But what had happened? Could anything have been fairer, franker, or fuller than the statement of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite who, rising in his place and speaking on behalf of the London and North Western Railway Company, made a statement. [An Hon. Member: It did not happen whilst he was there.] He recognised and he thought the House must recognise that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman was speaking not only for himself but for those he represented—the other directors. What did he say? He said in the fullest and frankest manner that this action was indefensible and that immediately the directors understood what they had done and had ascertained that this body was a Party association, they themselves refunded the money they had sent to it and authorised him to apologise to the House. The directors admitted that they had acted under a mistake, but they did their best to withdraw their action. He was not an old Member of the House, but his short experience led him to believe that whatever it was the House was not vindictive. When a man made a mistake and frankly withdrew the House forgave him at once, and when a body outside the House made a mistake and sent down a right hon. and gallant Member to assure them that it had made a mistake and apologised for its conduct, the House ought not to say that the act was deliberately done, but ought to accept the withdrawal and apology, especially if they were satisfied that this particular company was not going to repeat its action and also that the Bill in question was a good Bill which should, apart from the action of the railway company in another matter, be sent upstairs to a Committee. The House not being vindictive ought, he thought, to accept the withdrawal of the railway company and allow the Bill to proceed. He ventured therefore to appeal to the House, not on personal grounds in the least, to allow that course to be taken. He held that the London and North Western Railway Company had acted fairly and honourably by the House. [Cries of, "No."] Well that was his opinion, and he again asserted that nothing could have been fuller and franker than the right hon. and gallant Gentleman's apology. Having regard to the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade, the House was absolutely safeguarded from any repetition of the conduct complained of. In these circumstances he hoped the House would agree to the Second Reading of the Bill.

Mr. BRIGHT (Oldham) thought he ought to offer some observations to the House before they came to a decision. He was one of the directors of the London and North Western Railway Company, and he was entirely out of sympathy with the association to which this subscription had been unfortunately given. It had, indeed, been rather a trial to him to have to pay out of his own pocket a portion of the subscription which had been given to the last association in the world that he should have subscribed to. He had done his share in making what amends he could, though he admitted that he had not been sufficiently wide awake when the subscription was given. If he had been he would have objected, but he had done his best to make reparation, and he felt a little hurt at some of the observations made by hon. Members. He thought they were a little ungracious. It was, he was certain, untrue that the company took any part in the election at Watford, although of course there might be ardent Conservatives as well as ardent Liberals amongst their employees who took an active part in the contest. To say, however, that the company did so was, he was convinced, absolutely untrue. He joined in the appeal of the last speaker that the House should allow the Bill to pass and he pointed out that if it did not pass it would do no harm to the directors, although it might do harm to the proprietors of the railway, who were absolutely guiltless in the matter. The rejection of the Bill would, moreover, do great injury to the districts through which the railway passed. The hon. Gentleman had mentioned Watford. It was impossible for the railway company to deal properly with the traffic of that place in the present congested condition of their line. They proposed to spend £2,000,000 on this line, and it would lead to a great stoppage of employment if it were not passed. After all the talk about the evils of unemployment he thought it would be a very serious thing for the House to reject this Bill. Then, again, there was Coventry, where an enormous trade was being done in bicycles and motor cars; that place also would be served by the new line. In addition there was the North Wales traffic which in the holiday season was very great, and the present conditions of the line made it very difficult to widen it. All these three projects would be knocked over if this Bill did not pass, and he thought that it would be a most strange and foolish thing if in consequence of a mistake of the directors the Bill was thrown out.

*Mr. HEMMERDE (Denbighshire, E.) desired to say a few words in the same sense as the last two speakers. He could not see why the House should throw out this Bill after the explanation given by the right hon. and gallant Member, which he most unreservedly accepted. He could not believe that the House would take the responsibility of throwing out the Bill because the London and North

Western Railway Company had done a certain thing acting under a misapprehension. It was open to question whether they had done anything illegal. An hon. Member the other night said with some confidence that the course which they had taken was a legal action. He rather doubted whether it was a legal action, but at any rate they had the explicit assurance that it was not done deliberately. He could not believe that the House would not accept that assurance. Undoubtedly the matter was a very serious one, but he did not believe that the evil of the influence of money in politics could be dealt with, either by the remedy suggested by the President of the Board of Trade, or by throwing out this Bill. They could not seriously deal with the matter by confining their attention merely to statutory companies. The President of the Board of Trade had said that they could not go in advance of public opinion, but he thought the better view was that of a great jurist, that all legislation should be anticapatory of public opinion and antecedent to expectation. If they were to deal properly with this question, they must, in addition to dealing with statutory companies, also make provisions in regard to all companies and all wealthy individuals who used their wealth for influencing legislation. That was really the question that they were face to face with to-day. The only way to meet that question was ruthlessly to cut down election expenses. Great companies were able to give subscriptions which never appeared in the account of the election expenses of the candidates, and that could only be prevented by legislation to the effect that they should not give these subscriptions unless they were returned in the account of the expenses of the candidates in whom they were interested. They could only do that by putting the strictest and narrowest limits on the power of candidates to spend money in their constituencies. That end would not be attained by losing temper with the London and North-Western Company. After the assurance given by the company, he asked the House to support the Second Reading of the Bill.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport) said the object which had to be decided by the vote upon this Bill was the expenditure of £2,000,000 on a particular class of development. Whatever one's views were on the particular transaction complained of no one would gainsay that the speech of the right hon. Member for Epping was a most frank avowal, and a guarantee that no such thing should recur. If it had not been for the intervention of one Member on that occasion the House would have been then prepared to give the Bill a Second Reading. His right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade was prepared to recommend that course, but owing to the intervention of the hon. and learned Gentleman it was thought desirable to carry over the discussion. The House had heard his right hon. friend say that in future there should be no reason to complain of any recurrence of the evil. Evidence had come to hand, however, which showed that similar transactions had taken place with dock and railway companies, and his right hon. friend held the view that unless steps were taken at once to check the development of the course which seemed to have been entered upon it would grow into a very great evil. It was under those circumstances that his right hon. friend had come down to the House and promised, first that the Board of Trade rules as to railway accounts should be so changed as to provide that the accounts submitted by the companies should disclose all these transactions; and, secondly, that he would bring in a Bill to deal with the whole matter. There could be, therefore, no complaint of the way in which the Government had met the question. The hon. Member for the Elland Division had withdrawn his Amendment, and he (Mr. Kearley) did not propose to go into the fresh issues that had been raised. He, however, thought it would be desirable if the railway companies could give an assurance either that they would permit neither political Party to have access to their premises, or that they would afford the privilege to both. He could not agree with the exception which had been taken to raising this matter on the Second Reading of a private Bill, and the mere fact of the Government having promised legislation showed how they viewed this evil. He hoped, therefore, the House would now be satisfied with the ample debate which had taken place and allow the Bill to have its Second Reading.

*Mr. HERBERT (Buckinghamshire, Wycombe) said the questions raised were of considerable importance. He thought the hon. Member for Elland had perfomed a public service by calling attention to the facts. He strongly deprecated the introduction of any Party feeling into the matter, and he believed hon. Members in all parts of the House would agree with him if they calmly considered the matter. There was a very large majority of Liberals in the House, and this subscription was made to the Moderate cause of the County Council, and a very large majority of Moderates were returned. It might be that if hostile action was taken on this Bill it might derogate from the character of the House. It might be represented as a reprisal for that subscription, and he did not believe any hon. Member would desire any such thing as that. He asked every Member, therefore, before he gave his vote upon the Bill to reflect what interpretation might be placed upon his giving an adverse vote. That state of affairs was a pure accident of the present case; it might well be that upon the Free Trade issue, Railway Companies would consider it to their interest to support the side of Free Trade, and it was therefore a matter which affected all Parties alike and all shareholders alike, and it was a matter which the House ought to attempt to deal with in a calm and judicial spirit. He did not agree with the hon. Baronet that the House was exceeding its rights in dealing with this matter; in his opinion it not only had the right, but it was its bounden duty to take up the matter and deal with it—as it was its duty when any evil arose—as effectively as possible. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade proposed to confine his remedies to statutory companies and not to apply them to all limited companies? They heard the other night that the managers of the dock companies had been advised that they were entitled to make such subscriptions, and that meant that individual shareholders who objected to the subscriptions being made would have to fight a statutory company possibly right up to the House of Lords, and the statutory company would be fighting those individual shareholders with their own money. He thought the same considerations applied to the shareholders of limited companies as to the shareholders of railway companies, and he trusted the President of the Board of Trade would consider whether it would not be wise to extend his proposed Bill to limited companies. There might be a provision expressly providing that the memorandum of association must make mention of the right of the directors to make these contributions if they were intended to have such a right. He hoped that the House would give the Bill a Second Reading. The railway company had acknowledged their error, and hon. Members therefore should give the Bill a Second Reading.

Mr. STRAUS (Tower Hamlets, Mile End) asked whether the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Epping could answer this Question: it was rumoured that one of the directors of the company, who was a successful candidate for the County Council, when this matter came before the Board, said if that there was any question about the contribution which had been authorised, he would pay it out of his own pocket.

Colonel LOCKWOOD, in reply to the hon. Member for East St. Pancras, said he had made very careful inquiries into the subject, and he could find no justification for the statement that facilities had been given to Moderate candidates to hold meetings on the company's premises. He could assure the hon. Gentleman that he quite understood his feelings, but the London and North Western Railway Company considered themselves as carriers of persons and goods, and the last thing they thought of was to interfere in political matters. He could not say anything of his own personal knowledge as to the question of candidature, but he was perfectly certain that both Parties would be treated alike, though speaking for himself he would not care to address a meeting in Euston station for fear of the windows. Their great idea was to keep absolutely clear of politics. He had made careful inquiry and he could not find that the statement of the hon. Member opposite was justified. He attended the Board meetings, and no such statement was made before him at any rate, and he thought the hon. Member was mistaken. But he would be very glad to receive further information from him, and to go into the question with him.

*Sir W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.) said he happened to represent the division in which Euston Station was situated. He had fought five County Council elections and two Parliamentary elections in the constituency, and he had been informed that the attitude taken up by the London and North-Western Railway Company when applied to for the use of their station premises was uniformly that they would not favour or allow facilities to either Party. Therefore it was with profound regret that he heard that that principle of neutrality had been departed from in the case of the recent County Council election. He thanked the hon. Member for the Elland Division for bringing the subject to the notice of the House, but he quite accepted the very honourable manner in which the right hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite had endeavoured so far as possible to make up for the breach of principle which occurred on that occasion. Having accepted the statement of the right hon. Gentleman, and having heard the assurance on behalf of the Government as to future legislation, he desired to offer no further opposition to the Bill now before the House.

*Mr. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.) said that in the town of Wolverton there were thousands of employees of the London and North-Western Railway Company, and he desired to say that it was absolutely untrue, as far as that town was concerned, that the railway company had brought the slightest political influence to bear on their servants; moreover he believed that any attempt of the kind would be keenly resented by the men themselves.

Main Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 209; Noes, 62. (Division List No. 144.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,RtHnSir Alex.F.
Agnew, George William
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonp'rt)
Benn,W.(T'w'r Hamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJH (Essex,Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Billson, Alfred
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Brigg, John
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J.F.L. (Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJT (Cheshire)
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,RtHnRichard Knight
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hn. Victor C.W.
Chance, Frederick William
Clark,George Smith(Belfast,N.)
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Clough, William
Coates, E. Feetham (Lewisham
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Corbett,A.Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grints'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dillon, John
Duckworth, James
Duncan, Robt. (Lanark, Govan
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Emmott, Alfred
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Forster, Henry William
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fuller, John Michael F.
Glendinning, R. G.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Houston, Robert Paterson
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kennaway, Rt.Hn. Sir John H.

Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Magnus, Sir Philip
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Morrell, Philip
Murnaghan, George
Murray, James
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Perks, Robert William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Radford, G. H.
Randles, Sir John Scurrah
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Rickett, J. Compton
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Rose, Charles Day
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Waring, Walter
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cooper, G. J.
Cremer, William Randal
Delany, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Essex, R. W.
Farrell, James Patrick
Fenwick, Charles
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harvey, W. E. (Derbyshire, N.E.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hogan, Michael
Hudson, Walter
Jackson, R. S.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
Meagher, Michael
Murphy, John
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Hare, Patrick.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Reddy, M.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Walsh, Stephen
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Watt, Henry A.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. H. C. Lea and Mr. Thorne.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Whiteley,*)—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at eighteen minutes after Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 26th April, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Taff Vale Railway Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Boston Spa Gas Bill; Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Great Northern and City Railway Bill. As amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

Swansea Harbour Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill; Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

PETITIONS.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.

Petition from Salisbury, against; to lie upon the Table.

COAL MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Digby; Eastwood; Gedling; New Hucknall; Selston; Sherwood; and Underwood Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

ECCLESIASTICAL DISORDERS BILL.

Petition from Salisbury, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) BILL.

Petition from Kilbucks, against; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petition from Salisbury, against; to lie upon the Table.

JURORS' EXPENSES BILL.

Petition from Essex, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Forres, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against; from Barrhead; Edinburgh and Leith; Glasgow; Partick; and West Kilpatrick; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Aberdeen (two); Alexandria; Alloa; Barrhead; Blairgowrie; Burnbank; Burra; Burra Isle; Cambuslang; Canisbay (two); Carluke; Clydebank (nine); Culbokie; Dalkeith (two); Dalmuir; Dumfries; Dumfries and Galloway; Duntocher; Edinburgh (eleven); Elgin; Fearn; Flotta; Fortrose; Fraserburgh; Galashiels; Gartsherrie; Glasgow (eight); Govan; Greenock (two); Hatton; Hawick; Inverness; Keiss; Kirkmahoe; Kirkwall (three); Lanark; Lauriston (two); Leuchars; Lochalsh; Lochee; Newton Mearns (three); Newport; Nitshill; Paisley (two); Partick; Perth (two); Peterhead; Prestwick; St. Andrews; Strathaven; Tain; Tayport; (two); Uddingston; and Yoker (two); to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition from Salisbury, against; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition from Forres, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from St. Alban's, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY TICKETS BILL.

Petition from Forres, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

SALE OF WHISKY BILL.

Petition from Forres, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

WEEKLY REST DAY BILL.

Petition from Forres, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883 (PROCEEDINGS).

Account presented, showing the Receipts and Expenditure on account of Bankruptcy Proceedings during the year ended 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 130.]

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP) ACT, 1890.

Account presented, showing Receipts and Expenditure on account of Proceedings during the year ended 31st March, 1907 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 131.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Irish Land Act—Section 2.

MR. FETHERSTONHAUGH (Fermanagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, so far back as April, 1904, Mr. C. E. Crean, of Ballyhaunis, county Mayo, endeavoured to avail himself of Section 2 of the Land Purchase Act of 1891, but was informed by the Secretary of the Irish Land Commission that he could not do so as no rules had been made under the section, can he say if the necessary rules have yet been made; and, if not, will he take steps to have it made possible for purchasers to take advantage of the section, as large numbers of them are now desirous of doing at once.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The fact is as stated in the first part of the Question. No rules have yet been made, but I understand that the Treasury is in communication with the departments concerned on the subject.

London Postal Sorters' Open Examination.

MR. STEADMAN (Finsbury, Central): To ask the Postmaster-General if the forthcoming examination for the position of sorter, London postal service, is to be the last examination for these positions; and, if so, what is the reason for abolishing the open competition for this class.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Answer is in the negative.

Kingscourt (County Cavan) Post Office.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the new post office and dwelling-house at Kingscourt, county Cavan, have been built at public expense; and whether the appointment of a sub-postmaster shall be confined to applicants from Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am informed that the sub-postmaster of Kingscourt is building an extension to his present premises at his own expense. As far as I am aware, there is no prospect of the office becoming vacant in the near future.

Income-Tax paid in Ireland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, having regard to the claim that more income-tax is paid in the counties of Ulster than in the counties of any other province in Ireland, he can issue a statement showing the amount collected in every county in Ireland, and the rate per head of the population in every county.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) No, Sir. As I have already explained, such a statement would be misleading and would not serve the purpose which the hon. Member desires.

Irish Valuation.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can issue a statement showing, according to the last available figures, the average valuation per inhabitant of the different Irish counties.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) This information has been supplied me and is as follows:—

County.	Population, 1901 Census.	Rateable Valuation, 1907.		Valuation per head of population.		
		£	s.	£	s.	d.
Province of Ulster.						
Antrim	196,090	722,657	9	3	13	8
Armagh	125,392	438,572	9	3	9	11
Cavan	97,541	279,175	5	2	17	3
Donegal	173,722	310,895	5	1	15	10
Down	205,889	824,420	13	4	0	1
Fermanagh	65,430	242,103	18	3	14	0
Londonderry	104,512	319,737	5	3	1	2
Monaghan	74,611	275,946	0	3	14	0
Tyrone	150,567	462,710	2	3	1	6
Belfast County Borough	349,180	1,490,832	0	4	5	5
Londonderry County Borough	39,892	112,763	10	2	16	6
Province of Munster.						
Clare	112,334	326,214	17	2	18	1
Cork	328,489	1,108,642	3	3	7	6
Kerry	165,726	309,274	16	1	17	4
Limerick	107,947	472,900	3	4	7	7
Tipperary, North Riding	67,815	276,851	11	4	1	8
Tipperary, South Riding	92,417	411,144	6	4	9	0
Waterford	60,418	266,828	1	4	8	4
Cork County Borough	76,122	184,097	15	2	8	4
Limerick County Borough	38,151	73,109	4	1	18	4
Waterford County Borough	26,769	51,374	12	1	18	5

County.	Population, 1901 Census.	Rateable Valuation, 1907.		Valuation per head of Population.		
		£	s.	£	s.	d.
Province of Leinster.						
Carlow - - - - - -	37,748	169,889	15	4	10	0
Dublin - - - - - -	157,568	840,298	2	5	6	8
Dublin County Borough - -	290,638	939,657	5	3	4	8
Kildare - - - - - -	63,566	339,389	6	5	6	9
Kilkenny - - - - - -	79,159	363,142	7	4	11	9
King's - - - - - -	60,187	247,690	14	4	2	4
Longford - - - - - -	46,672	153,179	19	3	5	8
Louth - - - - - -	65,820	248,129	0	3	15	5
Meath - - - - - -	67,497	551,318	4	8	3	4
Queen's - - - - - -	57,417	257,501	4	4	9	8
Westmeath - - - - -	61,629	326,519	18	5	6	0
Wexford - - - - - -	104,104	388,330	2	3	14	7
Wicklow - - - - - -	60,824	293,994	18	4	16	8
Province of Connaught.						
Galway - - - - - -	192,549	480,894	19	2	9	11
Leitrim - - - - - -	69,343	138,562	1	2	0	0
Mayo - - - - - -	199,166	321,881	14	1	12	4
Roscommon - - - - -	101,791	301,425	10	2	19	3
Sligo - - - - - -	84,083	214,712	2	2	11	1

Promotion in the General Valuation Office, Dublin.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he has had under consideration the fact that an assistant clerk in the General Valuation Office, Dublin, with reference to whose proposed promotion the Treasury have decided to take no action until a second-division vacancy to which he could be appointed occurs in that or some other office, has no prospect, if this decision is adhered to, of obtaining such promotion for several years; whether he is aware that no vacancy will occur in the normal course in the Valuation Office for over ten years, and that the heads of other departments have expressed their natural unwillingness to accept him as a second-division clerk in view of the claims to promotion of assistant clerks belonging to their own staffs; and whether he is willing, as a solution to the matter, to sanction the issue of a certificate of qualification to the official in question, he then to wait, with the other candidate second division clerks on the books of the Civil Service Commissioners, an appointment as a second-division clerk in any Dublin office to which he may be assigned by the Commissioners.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the ratio existing between the number of second-division clerks and of assistant clerks employed in the General Valuation Office, Dublin, has remained constant for some years; whether in the meantime the volume and importance of the work of this department have considerably increased, especially as regards the better-class clerical work; whether he is aware that an assistant clerk in this office, who is acknowledged to be engaged on work of a superior class, and has consequently been recommended for promotion to the second division, is obliged to wait till a vacancy in this grade occurs in the normal course before this recommendation is considered: and whether, considering that such a vacancy will not arise under ordinary conditions for several years, and that this clerk must naturally look for promotion in the office to which he is at present assigned, he will adjust the ratio of the clerical staff in accordance with the development of the work of the office.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I have no information as to when a second-division vacancy might occur in the Valuation Office or some other department to which the assistant clerk referred to could be appointed; but I do not consider it practicable to follow the course suggested by the hon. Member. The Treasury has not received any representation from the Commissioner of Valuation to the effect that the number of second-division clerks in the department is inadequate for the performance of the duties assignable to that class.

Income Tax—Schedule E—Persons Resident Abroad.

MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, having regard to the decision of the City Commissioners in the case of Mr. Duff, it is the intention of the Revenue authorities to tax under Schedule E of the Income Tax Act the servants of English companies resident and earning their salaries abroad; and whether such a course is in accordance with the practice hitherto pursued under Schedule E.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) It is not intended to make any change in the existing practice, which is as follows:—Where servants of an English company are wholly resident abroad and do not discharge any of their duties in the United Kingdom, they are not regarded as assessable to income tax on their salaries. Where a person, though resident abroad, holds a directorship of an English company and attends meetings of the directors in the United Kingdom, he is assessable to income tax on his fees as director under Schedule E. This was Mr. Duff's case.

Carnarvon Castle—Maintenance and Upkeep.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask the First Commissioner of Works what sums have been annually expended during the last ten years on the maintenance and upkeep of Carnarvon Castle.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) As the Office of Works did not take charge of Carnarvon Castle until December last, I am not in a position to give the information asked for by the noble Lord.

Decrease of Population of Ulster.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what has been the decrease of population in each of the counties of Ulster since 1841; and what has been the emigration from each of the counties during the same period, giving in each case the figures for the city of Belfast separately from those for the county of Antrim.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The following table gives the information asked for so far as it is available:—

Counties.	Population Census of 1841.	Decrease in 1901 as compared with 1841.	† Number of Emigrants, 1st May, 1851, to 31st December, 1906.
Antrim (exclusive of Belfast) - -	290,530	94,440	269,437 (inclusive of Belfast)
Armagh - - - - - -	233,024	107,632	99,349
Cavan - - - - - - -	243,262	145,721	117,671
Donegal - - - - - -	296,540	122,818	129,700
Down (exclusive of Belfast) - - -	361,487	155,598	146,621 (inclusive of Belfast)
Fermanagh - - - - - -	156,852	91,422	56,278
Londonderry - - - - -	222,461	78,057	108,434
Monaghan - - - - - -	200,516	125,905	76,369
Tyrone - - - - - -	313,011	162,444	140,579
Belfast City - - - - -	71,580	277,600 Increase	‡

† Emigration Returns were not prepared prior to 1851.

‡ Separate emigration statistics for Belfast are not available. The figures for Belfast are included under Antrim and Down, in which counties it is situate.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Reinstatement of Patrick Cormack and James Feehan.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say if any steps have yet been taken by the Estates Commissioners to bring about the reinstatement of Patrick Cormack and James Feehan, evicted tenants on the estate of Temperance Anne Lamphier, of Foilacamin, near Thurles, in the county of Tipperary; and, if so, with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) My predecessor informed the hon. Member on 7th May last that these men are not evicted tenants. The persons of whom they claim to be the representatives surrendered the farms for monetary compensation many years ago, and the holdings have since been sold under the Act of 1903 to the occupying tenant. The Estates Commissioners inform me that they do not intend to reopen the matter.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Case of Philip Sweeney.

MR. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland why the Estates Commissioners are unable to take any action in the case of Philip Sweeney, an evicted tenant on the estate of Owen Wynne, county Leitrim.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have made inquiries into the case of Philip Sweeney, who has applied for reinstatement in the holding formerly occupied by him and now occupied by another tenant. The Commissioners have, in the exercise of their discretion, decided that, having regard to the circumstances and to No. VI. of the Lord-Lieutenant's Regulations of the 13th February, 1906, the case is not one in which they should take any action.

Evans Estate, Killoman—Request under Section 40 of the Land Act, 1896.

MR. DOLAN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether a request under Section 40 of The Irish Land Act, 1896, has been lodged with the Estates Commissioners regarding the Evans estate, Killoman, county Leitrim.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed that in February last the Land Judge directed a request under Section 40 of the Land Act, 1896, to be lodged with the Land Commission. It recently came to the knowledge of the Land Judge that the request had not been lodged in pursuance of his direction. On the 19th instant the learned Judge had the case listed before him and expressed his strong disapproval of the action of the solicitors in charge of the proceedings, and ordered the request to be lodged forthwith.

Irish Evicted Tenants—Application of Patrick Fitzpatrick.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from Patrick Fitzpatrick, Drumrush, Drumsladdy, Belturbet, county Cavan; are the Estates Commissioners in treaty for any untenanted land in county Cavan; and will this evicted tenant's claim have their attention.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are unable to trace the receipt from this evicted tenant of an application for reinstatement. Some 600 acres of untenanted land in county Cavan are at present being inspected on behalf of the Commissioners with a view to purchase.

Irish School Teachers—Publication of Personal Details in Daily Report Book.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the Commissioners of National Education have recently issued a form to every teacher, which, when filled in, is to be permanently pasted in the daily report book, and which requires, amongst other matters, the publication of the teacher's age and grade; and whether, seeing that under existing rules the public have access to this book, and having regard to the consequent unpleasantness to the teacher of having such personal details published, and the general dissatisfaction caused among the teaching profession in consequence, he will suggest to the Commissioners that such details should be furnished in the inspector's observation book.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that the Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The Commissioners are at present considering the propriety of having the form inserted instead in the inspector's observation book, which is not open to inspection by visitors.

Army Service and Civil Service Pensions.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can secure the issue of a Treasury Warrant enabling non-pensionable service with the colours to be reckoned with Civil Service pensionable time in computing the amount of pension to be given at the expiration of Civil Service, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on the employment of ex-soldiers and sailors.

(*Answered by Mr Secretary Haldane*). The matter is still under consideration.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

*MR. R. BALFOUR (Lanarkshire, Partick) in moving the Second Reading, said he would endeavour to deal with the subject as briefly as possible. The evils of intemperance need not be dwelt upon; they must at various times have come within the cognisance of every Member of the House. The highest medical authorities had expressed themselves in unmistakeable terms on the subject, and many of our leading municipalities had issued warnings to their citizens with respect to the physical deterioration arising from the abuse of alcohol. Temperance reformers had laboured with this problem for many years, with a self-devotion which could not be too strongly recognised by the House. They had been called upon to struggle with the obstruction of vested interests, and with the indifference of those who claimed that the growth of public sentiment would be sufficient to bring about a better state of things, and that legislative interference was not necessary. Temperance reformers did not claim that intemperance could be removed from our borders by Act of Parliament, but they did claim—and that most strongly—that it could be greatly mitigated by legislation which would lead to the withdrawal or restriction of facilities for obtaining alcoholic liquors—facilities which were so greatly in excess of reasonable requirements as to be a public scandal. It might be argued that the removal of facilities would not in itself reduce intemperance. They might as well, he suggested, argue against the efficacy of the petition, "Lead us not into temptation." But there was available evidence that cause and effect were very closely allied in this matter. The returns of cases of drunkenness in Glasgow for three-year periods before and after the passing of the Forbes-McKenzie Act were: before, 71,648; after, 53,146. Cases of drunkenness on Sunday for similar periods were: before the passage of the Act, 4,082; after, 1,466. There was further evidence to the effect that cases of crime committed when under the influence of drink during the same periods were: before the passage of the Act, 34,972; after, 19,370. These figures spoke for themselves. But let them take a more recent example in another country with which he was personally familiar. The city of San Francisco met with a great disaster about a year ago. Before the disaster there were about 3,200 public-houses, and arrests for drunkenness averaged about 1,500 per month. The public-houses were closed during May and June, and reopened during August and September. The arrests for drunkenness during the closed two months were 259, and for disturbance of the peace 78; while during the open two months the figures were 994 and 280 respectively. He maintained that these comparative figures afforded very strong evidence in support of the contention that intemperance could be effectively dealt with by the curtailment of facilities—that was, of temptation. This brought him to the consideration of the method of dealing with the question. The Bill before them applied to Scotland only, and there could, he submitted, be no question that Scottish opinion was pronouncedly in favour of the principle of local option, with power vested in the ratepayers to prohibit, or, alternatively, to restrict the opening of public-houses within their respective areas. The Bill introduced by Mr. Hunter Craig, late Member for Govan, two years ago, entitled "Liquor Traffic Local Veto (Scotland) Bill," was discussed in the late Parliament on 5th May, 1905, and although it was defeated by a majority (Ayes, 109; Noes, 142) of 33, it was supported by thirty-three Scottish Members, against fourteen dissentients, or a majority of over two to one in favour of the Bill. Then let them take the record of the present Parliament. The local option Resolution, moved by his hon. friend the Member for the Appleby Division of Westmoreland on 10th April, 1906, was carried by a large majority (Ayes, 271; Noes, 44); and on that occasion it was supported by thirty-one Scottish Members against only three dissentients. They were entitled to assume that the opinion of the Scottish people on this subject was represented by the Scottish Members of the House, especially as their Vote in support of local control in the last Parliament had been so amply confirmed in the present Parliament, and it could not be disputed that the question of temperance legislation was fully before the Scottish people throughout the last General Election. If further confirmation of Scottish opinion was desired it was to be found on the records of the House, a large number of petitions—he understood about 550—having been lodged in support of the Bill, while about fifty-five petitions had been lodged against it. Local option in various forms, doubtless designed to meet the varied wishes and circumstances of each case, had been adopted in most of our Colonies, and there was a progressive sentiment in the Colonies in favour of thus placing the control of the liquor traffic in the hands of the people. The same remark applied to the United States, and it was difficult to understand on what principle it could be maintained that the people whose comfort and well-being and whose hearths and homes were alone concerned should not be empowered to control their own destinies in this matter. Landowners had been accustomed to exercise the legal right of prohibiting or limiting the opening of public-houses on properties controlled by them. On what principle could it be maintained that communities should not be entitled to exercise the same privilege? Surely a community of people had rights at least equal to those of an individual. Arguments had been put forward that prohibition in localities would lead to the contamination of adjacent areas. But if that were so, the adjacent areas had the remedy under the Bill in their own hands. Further, it had been argued that prohibition would result in evasions of the law. On that principle it might with equal force be claimed that there should be no punishment for crime because criminals sometimes evaded punishment; but for his own part he had confidence enough in the administration of the law in this country to feel sure that there was no ground to apprehend serious difficulties in that connection. For convenience he would state the details of the Bill. It provided that—

> "A poll shall be taken upon a requisition signed by not less than one-tenth of the parish electors of the area. The parish electors are ratepayers. Electors may sign requisitions for both a prohibitory and limiting resolution, and where there are requisitions for both such resolutions, the poll on them shall be taken together. The poll shall be taken not earlier than three weeks, or later than four weeks, after the requisition or requisitions have been presented. When a poll is taken of both a prohibitory and a limiting resolution, an elector may not vote for more than one resolution. The votes on the prohibitory resolution shall be counted first, and if that resolution is carried, the votes on the limiting resolution shall not be counted. If the prohibitory resolution is not carried, the votes polled in favour of such resolution shall be added to those polled in favour of the limiting resolution. If a majority of not less than three-fifths of the votes recorded are in favour of a prohibitory resolution, the said resolution shall be carried, and so long as such prohibitory resolution remains unrepealed, no certificate shall be granted or renewed for the sale of excisable liquors within that area. And if a majority of the votes recorded are in favour of a limiting resolution, that resolution shall be carried, and, during the time such limiting resolution remains unrepealed, the number of certificates to be granted for the sale of excisable liquors within that area shall not exceed three-fourths of the number existing at the date of the poll, without prejudice to the discretion of the licensing authority to grant a less number of certificates than the three-fourths. In either case, the resolution shall come into operation in the area on the 28th day of May in the year succeeding that in which the poll is taken. Provision is made under which arrangements may be carried out with the licensing court for carrying out limiting resolutions on the most equitable terms. Where a prohibitory or limiting resolution is in force, a further poll shall not be taken before the expiration of three years from the date such resolution came into force, but after such expiration another poll may be taken: (*a*) if a prohibitory resolution is in force then, on a resolution for repealing the same, and (*b*) if a limiting resolution is in force, then on a prohibitory resolution, or on a resolution for further limitation, or a resolution for repealing the existing resolution; and the same majorities shall apply as in the case of the original poll."

The local authorities and areas were set forth in Clause 7 of the Bill, and were believed to be in conformity with the conditions with which the Act would have to deal. It was proposed that the Act, so far as it related to existing certificates, should come into operation on the 28th day of May next, after the passing thereof, but the provisions of the Act relating to requisitions and taking of polls should come into operation immediately after the passing thereof. The governing principle of the Bill was that it conferred upon the inhabitants of local areas in Scotland the power to exercise a direct control over the liquor traffic in their neighbourhood. There might be points of detail in the Bill which would require modification, but that was a question for the Committee Stage; they now contended for the principle of the Bill. It did not legislate in advance of public opinion; it merely provided means under which the public could express their wishes, and give practical effect to them, and the possession of power—even if not exercised—to prohibit or restrict the issue of certificates would have a most wholesome influence upon the manner in which public-houses were conducted, and—where exercised—the promoters of the Bill held the view that there would be created in these areas "object lessons" of comfort and prosperity which would lead to the adoption of similar measures in other areas. He appealed to the House to give the Scottish people the power which they desired, and he begged to move the Second Reading of the Bill.

*MR. BARNES (Glasgow, Blackfriars), in seconding the Motion, said arguments in favour of the measure were well known and had often been stated. The experience of our own Colonies and the Scandinavian countries had justified the statement that the time had arrived for some practical action to be taken. He wished to remove an erroneous impression which appeared to exist in the minds of some hon. Members in regard to the attitude of the Labour party upon legislation of this character. A few weeks ago the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil, whose enforced absence from the House he was sure they would all deplore, stated that drink was not the primary cause of unemployment. With that the Labour Party agreed, and would have agreed if he had said further that the primary cause of unemployment was the private ownership of the means of life. Upon that occasion the hon. Member was much misunderstood, and he wished to assure the House that the members of the Labour Party were glad upon all occasions to associate themselves with any well-conceived effort to lessen an insidious and gigantic evil which, whatever might be said about its general consequences in regard to unemployment, they were all agreed was the cause of much individual unemployment, of poverty, suffering, and mental and physical weakness, and in its social and moral aspect was eating into the national life of the country and weakening national efficiency. The Labour Party Conference last year discussed the same proposition that was embodied in this Bill, and after a lengthy discussion it was found that delegates representing 660,000 were in favour of the proposal and those representing 103,000 against it. The significance and strength of those figures was emphasised when he pointed out that the 103,000 minority were by no means against temperance legislation, but were against this particular proposition because it did not go far enough to satisfy them. In seconding the adoption of the Bill he was speaking on behalf of the Labour Party. He was also speaking as a Scottish Member, and he had the authority of the Scottish Temperance Party who had dome him the honour of asking him to second this Motion. A strong argument in favour of the Bill was the fact that no less than sixty-one out of seventy-two hon. Members representing Scotland were pledged to its support. If representative Government meant anything he thought that fact alone was sufficient to warrant the assent of Parliament being given to the Bill. In Scotland they had had Sunday closing for many years, and in recent years they had adopted earlier closing than formerly. A good deal of cheap sarcasm had been indulged in with regard to the Forbes-MacKenzie Acts, but no one in their sober senses in Scotland would desire to go back to the bad old time prior to the passing of those Acts. A good many figures had been submitted to the House in connection with convictions for drunkenness and things of that sort. He did not propose to give any figures, because he found they were often used to bamboozle people. Anyone who had ordinary intelligence and powers of observation could see for themselves an immense improvement in the streets of Glasgow, Dundee, and many other places as the result of the earlier closing of public-houses which had taken place in Scotland. Scotland was now ripe for another step in temperance legislation. He appealed to English and Irish Members—and he was sure there was no need to appeal to Welsh Members—and to all sections of the House not to stand in the way of Scotland bringing about a reform of this kind. He had much pleasure in supporting the Bill upon its merits. It did not go far enough for him, because he would like legislation which would eliminate private profits from the drink trade, which he would like to see conducted, if possible, in accordance with the public welfare, and in such a way as to provide counter-attractions in the public-house other than alcoholic liquors. The Bill was good so far as it went, because it was an extension of a democratic principle to a matter vitally affecting the people in their everyday life. It was an extension of that principle in the best of all possible ways, because it extended the principle without the intermediary who was always biassed by class, money, or political interests. He did not wish to say anything in a disparaging sense of the publican, who he believed had got more than the ordinary fair share of the milk of human kindness. He did not believe the public-houses however supplied an ordinary and legitimate demand; they created that demand. Those who treated the demand for alcoholic liquors in the same way as a demand for any other commodity showed a lamentable lack of knowledge of human nature with all its frailties and weaknesses. As a workman many cases came under his own observation of men who would be willing under the operation of this Bill, if they had a chance, to remove public-houses out of their way in order that temptation might be removed. There were men who would willingly vote for the abolition of public-houses, who desired to give up the drink, but could not do so because they had so often to pass the open door of the public-house with its enticing smell. Although in such cases the spirit was often willing the flesh was very weak. This Bill would give such men an opportunity of saving themselves from the temptation to drink. It had been said that in Newport the Sunday closing of public-houses had resulted in the people going three miles to get drink. He thought such things were only temporary, and they would very soon right themselves, and in any case the temptation to drink in Newport would be less than it was before. It was said that measures of this kind would tend to separate certain sections of the community one from another and would cause a good deal of dislocation. That might be so, but he would remind the House that the power they sought to give to the people was as a matter of fact already enjoyed and exercised by public companies and by landlords, many of whom laid it down as a stipulation that there should be no liquor shops within their particular areas. As a matter of fact there were a great many places near London where large areas had been so fixed up by the landlord and no intoxicating liquor was sold in them. A few weeks ago he was down at Nottingham in company with one of the representatives of that county, who took him over one of the districts in that county where this very provision had been carried out by the landlord, and he could not help noticing the prim, well-kept appearance and the general prosperity of that district as compared with other parts. Even if the effect of this measure was to separate one part of the community from another, he did not think it would be a bad thing, because such an object lesson would in time tell in other places. The statement was sometimes made that they could not make people sober by Act of Parliament. Nobody sought to do anything of the kind, but what they did seek to do was, at all events, to cease making people drunk by Act of Parliament. As the very word itself implied, licence was given to people to sell drink, and this privilege was enjoyed on account of something which had been done in the House of Commons. The object of legislation and the function of Parliament was to make it easy for people to do well and difficult to do ill. It was upon those lines that this Bill was framed. He had much pleasure in seconding the Motion, and commending the measure to the judgment of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*Mr. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) moved an Amendment asking the House to decline to proceed further with a measure which, while leaving the right of supplying alcoholic liquor in clubs and dispensaries unrestricted, would deprive brewers, licensees, and the investing public of their property without compensation. He said he did not know whether there was any prospect of the Government taking up the Bill, but no doubt in the course of the debate they would hear. If there was any prospect at all of the Government taking it up there was perhaps no excuse necessary for one who had no claim to represent Scotland moving an Amendment. He might remind the House that an hon. Member from the north of England who spoke in a similar debate two years ago claimed to take part in the discussion, although an English Member, on the ground that if the principle of local option was applied to Scotland, it must inevitably be extended to England. He could not help thinking that if that view was well founded and shared to a considerable extent by hon. Gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, it was reasonable that English Members should not be precluded from expressing their opinions. He might also remind the House that the Scottish representatives on the other side had hardly in the past practised the moderation in these matters which they expected from Members of the present Opposition who did not occupy Scottish seats. Hon. Members representing Scotland had been by no means backward—he thought quite rightly—in expressing their opinions on Licensing Bills which related exclusively to England. In the division on the Sunday Closing (England) Bill of 1897, two voted against and thirty-six for the measure. He did not think he need pursue that argument. The seconder of this Bill had pointed out that Scotland in its temperance legislation was already far ahead of England. He agreed that there were many statutes on the book relating to Scotland which went further than English licensing legislation. There was provision for Sunday closing, for ten o'clock closing, and for holiday closing; but he drew a rather different inference from the fact that Scotland possessed these exceptional conditions. He did not gather that it was suggested in any quarter of the House that Scotland was to-day more sober than England. Unless that position was advanced, hon. Gentlemen were driven to one of two assumptions, namely, either the assumption that the Scottish people were inherently more addicted to drunkenness than the English—a proposition which he would like to hear hon. Members commending to their constituents—or, the assumption of the entirely inconsistent view that this exceptional remedial legislation, not yet attempted in England, had produced no satisfactory results in Scotland. The hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division, who had unrivalled claims to be heard from the temperance reform point of view, had indicated a clear and impressive opinion on this very point. Writing in the "National Review" he said—

> "Broadly speaking these improved conditions are in force in Scotland and intemperance and all the evils of the drinking system abound there."

He did not think that was very encouraging. When the House was asked to adopt special legislation on the lines of local veto, one was inclined to look to hon. Members for guidance as to the principle on which local veto depended, but one discovered that very little assistance was given by those who had spoken in this House or elsewhere. What was the principle or criterion by which to judge legislation on which local option was alleged to depend? Was it trust in the people? The House would see that the last thing which the advocates of this measure did was to trust the people. That was what they neither proposed nor tolerated. They would only trust the people within the limits of their own preconceived prejudices. In other words, if the people in a particular district were desirous of additional facilities, it was not proposed by the Bill that they should get them. They would not hear of these facilities being given, although they were necessary and reasonable. Considerable reference had been made to the fact that there were large areas in this country in which by prohibition imposed by landlords there had been practically a suppression of the trade in alcoholic drinks. He would like some evidence—and none up to the present had been forthcoming—that persons who were denied in these districts the opportunity of getting alcoholic refreshment were in the condition of idyllic enjoyment they were assumed to be in by those who had spoken of those districts. He entirely declined to believe that the people who lived in those districts were satisfied without alcoholic refreshment, any more than Members of this House would be satisfied if they could not obtain it. He would like to see any Government, however great its majority, propose that in the smoking-room they should be denied constant opportunities of obtaining it. The most powerful Government of modern times could not last a week if that were proposed. As to the instance of the Toxteth Division of Liverpool which had been mentioned, he replied that no evidence could be more instantly disposed of by those acquainted with the facts. In the first place, nearly all the houses in the Toxteth division were rented at £30 a year, and therefore the people living there were almost all able to keep such reasonable refreshments as they required in their own cellars. He could show hon. Gentlemen a map indicating the licensed premises in Liverpool, and could demonstrate that some of the largest and most profitable premises in Liverpool were those in the district contiguous to Toxteth. They were doing a wholly fictitious trade by reason of the absence of licensed premises in the Toxteth Division. In other words the thirsty inhabitants of Toxteth were indulged at the expense of their neighbours while they continued to adorn the perorations of teetotal speeches. Was there anybody in the whole House who believed in local option as a complete remedy? He had been at some pains to ascertain, and he said unhesitatingly that there was no prominent temperance reformer in this country who believed that a remedy would be found in local option. The hon. Member for Partick in spite of his present attitude was a strong and logical opponent of the principle of local option. A representation was made to the Home Secretary on the subject of Sunday closing in England, and the question arose whether it could be effected by local option or by some centralised control. The hon. Member for Partick was one of the signatories of the memorial. The significant argument used by the hon. Gentleman was thus stated—

> "Local option would be unworkable and impracticable. It would multiply in hundreds of cases the border difficulty. It would create and increase the nuisance and evil of travelling for drink. This would mean an increase in public drunkenness."

Did the hon. Gentleman think that people who would travel for drink on Sunday would not travel on week-days? The memorial continued—

> "Referring the matter to the localities would involve needless and unwelcome strife and expense every few years in all parts of the country."

Surely it was obvious that if local option was undesirable in connection with Sunday closing on account of the border difficulty and travelling, it was equally so in regard to prohibition. It was also worthy of the attention of the House that any measure which provided as one of its terms for the introduction of absolute prohibition was open to every objection which could be urged by the experience of the civilised world to prohibition pure and simple. He thought he could satisfy the House that that was a reasonable proposition. It did not matter to the individual who felt that he was denied the facilities to which he was entitled whether the prohibition proceeded from a centralised authority in London or a local authority in the town in which he lived. In either case the drought was equally intolerable to the individual. What had been the experience of the whole civilised world so far as prohibition was concerned? It was well known that the attempt to establish prohibition in the United States had been an unqualified and disastrous failure. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] He was sure he could satisfy the hon. Gentleman that he had not used too strong language. An American committee consisting of fifty distinguished sociologists in a Report on this subject said—

> "The efforts to enforce prohibition during forty years have had deleterious effects in public respect for courts, judicial procedure, oaths, and law in general, and for officers of the law, legislatures, and public servants."

The attitude in the United States of every prudent candidate was expressed in the words—

> "I am in favour of Maine law, but against its enforcement."

A book had been placed on the Table of the House within the last few days containing most exhaustive Consular reports as to the results of prohibition in the United States, and so striking was the conclusion at which they unanimously arrived that he made no apology to the House for quoting the following extract—

> "At one time or another seventeen States have had stringent prohibition. It is now only retained by three (agricultural) and in these it cannot be looked upon as a success. Parts of prohibitory States have always been in open rebellion against the law; drinking has never been impossible, the sale of liquor has always been profitable and seldom disreputable. Violation of the law has been open and avowed. In urban districts it has not been possible to find any sound ethical basis for the law or to persuade the majority to regard its violation as immoral. Juries have violated their oaths; judges have hesitated to impose statutory penalties, blackmail and corruption have been directly instigated and the law brought into contempt."

*MR. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby): Would the hon. Member read what the report says about local option in contradistinction to prohibition?

*MR. F. E. SMITH thought he had made it clear to the House that the basis of his argument was that a local option Bill which provided for prohibition was open to the same objection as prohibition itself. He would deal with the observations on local option in a moment. But let him call as a witness an honourable Gentleman opposite. The hon. Member for the Woodstock Division of Oxfordshire visited the United States last summer, and in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* he had given testimony which everyone would greatly value as to the experience of prohibition there.

At the hotel where he resided no representation whatever could procure him any drink (he noted in passing that his hon. friend had evidently exhausted the arts of entreaty), and after dinner, being desirous of some alcoholic refreshment, he left the hotel to see if he could discover it in the town. In walking through the town he passed a doorway which somehow suggested alcohol. He would point out to the House that they could not legislate for exceptional cases, and therefore they could hardly assume that the average man enjoyed the highly developed sensibility of his hon. friend. His hon. friend said that he entered a bar and obtained drink—it was only a glass of beer—but half a dozen other persons were drinking; and flasks of whiskey were freely sold to disreputable persons afterwards. He paused to lament the fall of his hon. friend. A Liberal Member! A temperance reformer! A theological lecturer! . . . . . .

> "Who would not laugh if such a man there be
> Who would not weep if Atticus were he?"

He continued that in an hour's walk he saw four or five other drinking-places and met at least twenty-five drunken men and women. There must have been a hiatus in his hon. friend's narrative, for he went on to state that he next visited the police station. That was a somewhat ambiguous phrase; but let it pass. There he saw six "drunks" who had just been brought in. He thought that the House would admit that so far as prohibition itself was concerned the whole of the case had disappeared, and that no reasonable temperance reformer would say that prohibition had been anything but a disastrous failure when applied to States containing large urban populations. As to the machinery of the Bill, prohibition depended upon the parish election register: *i.e.*, the county council or municipal electors. But that would exclude the household franchise electors, the occupancy voters, the service voters, and the lodger voters. Now prohibition could be carried by three-fifths of the votes polled; but the voters constituted only one-twelfth of the population; and assuming that a third voted in a large population, three-fifths of a third of a twelfth, that was one-sixtieth of the population might carry prohibition, and one-seventy-second of the population might carry limitation of public-houses in the town or district. He was reminded that in a Consular report for 1907 it was stated that in Waterville, New Hampshire, one elector turned up and unanimously carried the cause of prohibition! It was said that local option might succeed when prohibition failed. He thought that that was illogical. Let them take the case of New Zealand. In 1881 Sir William Fox's Act for local option was passed, and in 1893 the Alcoholic Liquors Sale Control Act was passed. There were elections in 1902 and 1905, but no progress had been made. On the other hand, there was a very considerable retrogression. In 1905 there were six districts in which there was no licence. The reductions had declined from nine to four, and there had been a very significent growth of prosecutions for illicit drinking. In 1871 these amounted to seventy-one, whereas in 1904 they had increased to 216. In regard to Canada the author of an article in the *Daily News* said that in Canada legislation has got ahead of public opinion on the temperance question.

> "The law in most of the provinces is so stringent that it is generally disregarded, not openly, but with a pretence of disguise."

And the highly respectable paper the *Christian Guardian* of Canada said—

> "It was easier to secure the Scott Act in the counties than to secure its enforcement and permanence."

Even the critics who held views so strongly as the hon. Member for Spen Valley said that—

> "Experience of the United States and Canada, whose temperance opinion was more general and advanced than here, showed that in the country districts the power was widely used, and that in towns the power was comparatively little used, and where used was laxly and with difficulty enforced."

The most serious difficulty of all was in regard to clubs. He had carefully read Section 81 of the Scottish Licensing Act of 1903. He admitted that the regulations under that Act in regard to clubs were a little more close than those of England; but that did not prevent those clubs being formed. And what was the result? Every single advance that was made in favour of temperence was lost by the growth of those clubs. [Cries of "No, no."] Hon Gentlemen did not agree, but he did not think that anybody in the House who had considered the matter would deny that in the large towns in Scotland the number of clubs had very largely grown within the last few years. [An HON. MEMBER on the MINISTERIAL Benches: They have been killed.] The hon. Member did not agree, but he did not think that anyone in the House from Scotland who had considered the reports of chief constables would deny that clubs had very largely increased in numbers within the last few years. So far as England was concerned, in 1887 there were 1,982 clubs, whereas in 1905 they had increased to 6,554, or an increase of over 4,000 during the same time that attempts were being made to get rid of licensed premises. It might be asked whether the objections which they urged to this Bill were purely destructive, or, in other words, whether they had any suggestion to make for the purpose of dealing with drunkenness in Scotland. He would point out that one vital difficulty in dealing with the proposals in the present Bill was the complete insecurity that was given to the licensed victuallers in Scotland. It was of the first importance that these should be of good character and respectability; and, if that were so, was it not clear that every single added element of precariousness in their position rendered it more difficult to obtain such a highly respectable class of men as licensees? He would take a concrete case. Let them suppose that in Glasgow by a three-fifths majority licences were refused to the present licensed victuallers and that after three years experience another poll was taken and that it was decided that the licences were to be restored. There was no provision that the men who had lost their living by having their licences cancelled by the previous poll would receive new licences. Could there be any more retrograde step than that? He said without hesitation that the only way of dealing with such a case as that in Scotland was to introduce legislation analogous to the legislation in England in 1904. [Ironical cheers.] He knew that that proposal would be treated as preposterous by certain hon. Members from Scotland. It was always difficult to discover where the Liberal Party stood on this question of compensation; but Mr. Gladstone had said over and over again that if they interfered with them the licence holders ought to have compensation. It was curious to realise that the authority of Mr. Gladstone was now seldom quoted in this House except on the Opposition Benches and amid Ministerial dissent, but what did Mr. Gladstone say?—

> "If Parliament should think it wise to introduce any radical change in the working of the liquor laws in such a way as to break down the fair expectations of persons which have grown up—whether rightly or wrongly, it is not their fault; it is our fault—their fair claim to compensation ought to be considered by the liberality of Parliament."

He and those whom he represented confined themselves to the modest aspiration that those interested in licences should not be precluded from assisting each other by a statutory system of mutual insurance. In Scotland to-day he was strongly of opinion that in many places the number of licensed houses was far in excess of the wants of the population. For instance, in the county of Kinross there was a public-house for every 202 of the population; and in Auchtermuchty there was a public house for every sixty of the population. Of course that excess could have been, but had not been, dealt with under the existing powers by the licensing magistrates. But what was taking place in England? In 1905 519 men were refused a renewal of their licences on the ground that they were not required. In 1906 1,575 were refused a renewal of their licences on the ground that they were not required; and the reason given was that compensation would be given to them. Was not that a valuable step made in the progress of reform? But what was the progress made in Scotland? In the same year forty-six licences had been taken away. They would never get a Scottish bench to reduce the number of licences so long as these persons were exposed to the great injustice of losing their livelihood. When they were told that the introduction of such legislation in Scotland would endow the brewers, he would point out that in England it was notorious that if twenty of the largest brewers in this country were taken it would be found that they had subscribed more to the compensation fund that had already been established than they had gained from it by the extinction of licences; that the Act had not only taken money from the brewers, but had at the same time done an immense amount of good for temperance. He would recommend to hon. Gentlemen opposite that they should extend to the judgment of their neighbour's affairs the same standard of conduct that they applied to their own. He had exchanged many cheerful glasses with hon. Gentlemen on the other side who were now wearing an unnaturally austere expression, and he would suggest to them that it was unwise for any great Party to yield to the temptation of trying to effect moral reforms at the pecuniary charges of other people. He appealed to the House to resist the temptation of laying up for themselves treasure in heaven by the inexpensive method of confiscating other people's treasure on earth. In the belief that that, and that alone, would be the effect of this Bill, that it would not advance the cause of temperance reform, but would work great injustice and injure a large number of reputable and respectable citizens, he begged to move.

VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH (Maidstone), in seconding the Amendment, said that the mover and seconder of the Second Reading had not touched various important objections to the Bill. All Members had one object in front of them, and that was the promotion of temperance in the country. But their ideas as to the promotion of temperance widely differed. Most Members on his side of the House would agree that certain methods, instead of bringing about a spirit of temperance all over the country, would have the diametrically opposite effect. He did not believe that anything in the nature of coercive legislation would promote temperance. Far more could be done by way of education, bringing up, and self-control. If he was convinced that local veto would secure temperance he would be the first to support it. But it would have the effect of promoting secret drinking, a system which all deplored, and of disseminating traffic in that bad spirit which far more from its quality than the quantity was so detrimental to the mental and physical conditions of all classes of the community. He ventured to say that if local option was adopted the victim of this evil would be subjected to the temptation of secret drinking in so-called social clubs. The Royal Commission of 1899 fought strongly against local option, and there was no doubt the effect of prohibition would be to increase the number of so-called clubs, and also lead to the serious anomaly that a man desiring to quench his thirst would have to go into the next locality where prohibition was not, and where the public houses would be doing what was called a roaring trade. Temperance must be set up by other means than strict regulations to restrict the sale of liquor. He would like to point out to those who were opposed to drinking on the ground that it was morally wrong that local option would not carry out their idea to any extent. Bills had been brought in by the Liberal Party in 1893 and 1895, and both those Bills died in their infancy. But they had one provision which was absent from this Bill. They gave three years breathing space before the Bill came into effect. It might be that the Government proposed to take up this measure, and it would be convenient to hear in the course of the debate whether that was their intention and whether they intended to deal with the question of local option in a Bill which enacted that three-fifths of those voting could close the licensed houses, and that limiting resolutions could be carried by a bare majority. In local elections at the present time, only 25 per cent. of the electors on the average voted, which meant that, while the Bill affected to give popular control, the very people who were most deeply concerned might have no voice in the adoption of local option at all What was the position of the working man who was entirely prohibited under this Bill from obtaining that sustenance from liquor which all were entitled to have? First, he would be able to obtain it on the order of his doctor, when he would only be allowed to have one drink. The other solutions were that he might be driven to belong to a club, or to content himself with water. This was a very arbitrary measure, and it was obvious that the danger of drinking to excess was far more imminent when a man was kept thirsty than when a man was able to quench his thirst without great difficulty. Under the Bill it would be possible for one area to be a prohibited area, while in the area next to it there was no prohibition at all. He did not think local option, had ever been an unqualified success. In New Zealand it had only caused the trade, previously carried on in the light of day, to be carried on in secret under the most disgusting and degrading conditions, and which naturally gave great trouble to the police, who had to resort to all sorts of espionage in order to find out how and where it was conducted. Again, in the United States, of seventeen districts which had adopted local option only three had adhered to their decision. It was obvious that the working man, after he had failed to obtain from his doctor the necessary assistance to enable him to quench his thirst, would have recourse to so-called clubs, and the result would be to exchange a properly controlled and licensed liquor trade for an uncontrolled, unlicensed secret liquor traffic; the spirit supplied would not be the good spirit that public houses now sold, but the spirit which would be detrimental both mentally and morally to those who consumed it. It was easy for one fanatical temperance reformer to pledge seventy Scottish members in a day. If those pledges were of the same nature as those by which the Government in other matters were supposed to be bound, too much importance need not be attached to them. He thought the legislation that had already been passed had carried out the object which all had in view, namely, the promotion of temperance all over the country. The last measure passed in 1904 allowed what this Bill did not, a system of compensation. It was now said that licensed victuallers had no reason to expect compensation, because they carried on their business under an annual licence which need not be renewed. But when their business had been taxed as it had been, and had been considered permanent property, and supported in that way by the Government, it could not be contended that compensation should not be given. In regard to Wales it could not be claimed that the Sunday Closing Act of 1881 had resulted in anything but a large increase in the number of drinking clubs. But, above all, the Bill was class legislation, and for that reason, if for no other, he would ask hon. Members to support the Amendment which he begged to second.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'that,' to the end of the Question, and add the words, 'this House declines to proceed further with a measure which will cause dislocation and insecurity amongst those engaged in the licensed victualling trade without any compensating advantage to the public, which leaves the right of supplying alcoholic liquor in clubs and dispensaries unrestricted, and which will deprive brewers, licensees, and the investing public of their property without compensation.'"—(*Mr. F. E. Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*Mr. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs) asked the House to note that no Scottish Member had ventured to move or second an Amendment to the Motion for the Second Reading. The English Members who had undertaken the duty had exposed their limited knowledge of Scottish conditions. Parish council electors were a sixth, not a twelfth, of the population; and although it might be the case in England that as low a proportion of voters as 25 per cent. took part in local elections, the people of Scotland had a higher opinion of their rights and duties as citizens, and 75 per cent. was the more probable proportion of the electors who went to the poll. The allusion of the noble Viscount to the United States really referred to the policy of prohibition, which was a very different thing from local option. This was not a prohibition Bill. With regard to local option, which was the policy of this Bill, it was reported by a member of our own Embassy that the systems of local option had had the greatest success in the States, and had, in fact, secured prohibition over the widest possible area with the least possible friction. These were Scottish principles and they wished to see them embodied in the law of Scotland. The noble Viscount had talked of compensation, but the Amendment spoke of confiscation of the property of the licence holders. He challenged the contention altogether that these people had any property. It was not their property; all they had was the advantage of a privilege which had been granted to them. Whatever England might have done, Scotland in this matter, as in many others, was on an entirely different footing. The Scottish people did not recognise that the licence-holders had any further property in the licence than the yearly value of the privilege granted to them by the community. At the present time no one suggested that licence holders should be given compensation, but nobody would object if the trade wished that they should have an insurance fund upon a voluntary basis. In fact, at the present time there were companies who would, he had been informed, take that risk, and no doubt, in anticipation of the passing of this Bill, the licence-holders had already effected insurances. So far as the question of restriction was concerned, Scotland's experience of previous measures of restriction was that they had been a great success. No one wished to revert to Sunday trading or to closing later than ten o'clock on week-days. Everybody admitted that Sunday closing had been a success, and if a house could be closed one day in seven, why could it not be closed on the other six? The closing at ten o'clock on week-days had also been a great success. The streets were quieter late at night and people went to bed earlier, and no one save the trade and its friends found any objection to that. The club difficulty had not been experienced since Lord Balfour's Licensing Act of 1903. Nothing had been said since the Act was passed and powers were given to the magistrates to close such places. Before then undoubtedly the police had great difficulty with those clubs, but the provisions of that Act were such that the club difficulty had been got over. They could have this further reform without difficulty with regard to clubs. Hon. Members talked about the haphazard nature of the system to be introduced by the Bill, but he suggested that the present system was infinitely more haphazard, for no one under it got any guidance from the law, and in different parts of the country the greatest differences prevailed in the policy that was pursued. Unfortunately they had no really democratic Bench, and the promoters of the Bill were asking that the people by popular election should be allowed to say how they wished the matter to be carried through. Hon. Members had pleaded very strongly on behalf of the working classes. They, after all, were the great sufferers, and they wished this Bill to pass. The rich people never allowed a public-house to be set down opposite their doors, but the poor man had to put up with that nuisance, and he had known many men who, finding a public-house set up at the foot of their stair, had had to consider the alternative of sacrificing either their property or their children. This Bill was not, he admitted, a complete remedy. No Bill ever was a complete remedy for the question it was meant to solve, and if other remedies could be suggested they would be glad to consider them. But here they had a concrete Bill demanded by the people of Scotland. It would not completely stop drunkenness, but it would do something to remove that curse which, he regretted to say, was the national curse of Scotland. All the people of Scotland asked was to have the power in their localities to work out their own salvation.

*MR. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich), said that as the Motion which stood in his name on the Paper† might not be reached, he would now make a few remarks, although he had no desire to stand between hon. Members for Scotland and their wish to get the Bill passed. He would rejoice to see it go to a Grand Committee. He would make no apology for intruding into the discussion, because, although the Bill related chiefly to Scotland, he held that English Members ought not to be debarred from participating in the debate. He did not intend to traverse the main provisions of the Bill, nor did he propose to express any opinion as to the merits or demerits of the Bill. He was quite content that Scotland should have her desires. But he desired to bring before the House what he considered to be a fatal defect in the measure. It made absolutely no provision, so far as he could see, for any kind of compensation to be paid to licensees deprived of their licences; that was a fatal defect in the Bill. He was not in the slightest degree interested on behalf of the trade; in fact, as a Liberal candidate, he knew how active their opposition could be. He spoke simply as an ardent temperance reformer. He had always regretted that, except in the case of Scotland and perhaps of Wales, no substantial measure of temperance reform had been carried in his lifetime, and he attributed much of the difficulty encountered in the temperance movement to the want of recognition of some equitable principle of compensation. If this Bill was passed into law, he did not believe that a single licensing authority would put its provisions into force. Conditions might be different in Scotland; but, after all, in all these matters equity must be observed, and he believed that hon. Members for Scotland would greatly expedite the passing of the Bill, and would commend it to public opinion, if they would agree to insert in Committee some such provision as he was suggesting. Licensees had no legal right whatever to compensation; there was nothing to prevent the authority from reducing the value of licences held by issuing ten times as many more, and indeed, that had been suggested by wayward and erratic reformers as a method for bringing the question to an issue. The State might at a moment's notice resume the right granted, but the inevitable result would be much suffering among a respectable body of traders as much entitled to consideration as any other class in the community, and he supported the principle of his proposal as an act of grace and expediency. It was sometimes said that under the Act of 1904 the licensing trade were paying their own compensation. That was true to some extent, but it was not altogether true, and in his opinion it ought to be understood that where any compensation was made, it was made not so much at the expense of the trade as at the expense of the State, which for purposes of expediency had postponed its right to resume the monopoly value of its own licences. If any provision of the kind were made, regard should be had for the actual licensee, and brewers should not get the larger share. The Report of the Peel Commission in 1899 contained a suggestion of a time limit of seven years in England and five years in Scotland, and if that recommendation in the Minority Report had been in the following year expressed in a Parliamentary enactment, the people of Scotland by this time would have had the control of the liquor traffic, and the people of England would have been well on the way to that consummation. Scotland was fortunate in being free from the application of the Act of 1904; the value of licences had not so much increased, and the adoption of an equitable principle of compensation would be the less difficult. As a temperance reformer he took his stand on the Report of the Peel Commission, believing that upon that ground a great temperance reform could be constructed with recognition of the principle of compensation. He would like to point out that, although the principle of compensation was not fully acknowledged in Scotland, it had been recognised by some of our greatest temperance reformers, and it was undoubtedly recognised in the Peel Report. There was one other point he would like to put to the House. In the course of the next year or two they were to have a comprehensive measure of licensing reform for England, and he took it as an axiom that in that measure some provision would be included in regard to compensation. Was it possible to conceive that they might have in England compensation for licences and a measure running coincidently in Scotland which made no such provision He commended that point to the Government. He did not stand there as an advocate of the trade in any respect; he had suffered too many blows and shocks from the trade in the course of his career as a Parliamentary candidate, but still he maintained that every class was entitled to equitable consideration in that House. He said, moreover, that if they were to move forward they would have to recognise the principle of compensation. If only it had been recognised a few years ago, both England and Scotland would now, as he had said, either have control of the liquor traffic, or be a long way on towards that great and desired consummation.

---

† On Second Reading of Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, to move, "That no Bill for giving the ratepayers control of the liquor traffic in their respective areas can be accepted as satisfactory to this House unless provisions be contained therein for giving, as an act of grace, an adequate time notice of equitable compensation to those persons who may be deprived of their licences by the exercise of the power which it confers."

*MR. CHARLES ROBERTS (Lincoln) said that some points had been raised by previous speakers on which he desired to touch, but before doing so he would refer to another point which appeared in the literature which had been circulated among Members. It had been said, for instance, that this question was not before the country, and that no hope had been held out for the passage of such a Bill into law. On the eve of the last general election the licensed trade issued a manifesto which he had thought might be useful on some future occasion. He had a quotation from it which he would read; appealing to licensed traders it ran—

> "No general election has ever meant so much to you as this. If you do not exert yourselves now you will have to face (1) Local Veto; (2) Time limit; (3) The revival of so-called magisterial discretion; (4) Repeal,

reversal, or amendment of the Licensing Act of 1904; (5) Sunday closing."

It went on in that strain and wound up with a flight of rhetoric—

> "Self-preservation is the first law of nature. No local veto, no confiscation, no increased taxes on licences, no time limit, no Sunday closing."

And then with ringing eloquence—

> "Still the same cry—'Freedom with sobriety, England free, and England sober."

This matter was before the country at the general election and was debated in 1905. The Scottish Local Veto Bill of that year was a more drastic measure, proposing a majority vote and not a three-fifths vote. He noted the fact that no less than twenty members of the present Administration voted for that Bill, including the Prime Minister, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary of State for Home Affairs, and he thought most of the prominent members of the present Ministry. Coming to some of the arguments advanced by the other side, it had been complained that a three-fifths majority would be unjust. He thought himself that three-fifths was too high a requirement. The usual requirement in local option Bills in the Colonies and elsewhere was a majority of voters.

An HON. MEMBER: Of all the electors?

*MR. CHARLES ROBERTS: No; of those voting. In some cases it was provided that 30 per cent. of the electors should vote. There would be no objection to that, though, of course, it was a detail which it was not his province to discuss just now, but he entered his caveat against the introduction of the three-fifths majority. At the present moment the Province of Ontario, in Canada, was rising with some indignation against the practical working of the three-fifths majority. If it were required in ordinary elections, the complexion of the House of Commons would be completely changed. The Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool, the Member for the Droitwich Division, and he himself would not be in the House; in fact, he did not know what ravages would be the consequence of such a change in the law. With reference to clubs, surely the Scottish provision was totally different. In Scotland they had the annual registration of clubs, and no club could be started in Scotland without the assent of two members of the licensing body. The police, the town council or the parish council could object to clubs on specified grounds, and they could be struck off the register. That seemed to be adequate, and he did not believe that Scotland would find real difficulty with clubs, any more than the no-licence districts of Canada or the no-licence districts of the United States. The question of compensation was also, no doubt, a committee point. It was a question which doubtless would affect the minds of hon. Members on the Second Reading, and for that reason he thought it wise to say a few words upon it. An English Member could perhaps deal with it better than a Scottish Member, because the English Member knew the distinction which existed and had to be drawn between English law and Scottish law. Hon. Members opposite, including the hon. Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool, had spoken as if no reduction of licences was going on in Scotland at the present time. But the reduction of licences in Scotland had been most remarkable. The Report of the Licensing Commission showed that in 1829 there were 18,000 licences in Scotland. To-day there were 6,991. They had got rid of 11,000 licences in Scotland without compensation since 1829. Some 4,000 of these, no doubt, had been turned into off-licences in 1882. They surrendered their rights of on-sale, but neither asked nor got compensation. The reduction was still going on at the present time. If they took the years from 1900, the figures showed that the reduction was steady and constant each year both of on-licences and of grocers' licences. Since that time, in Scotland, they had seen a reduction of 3·2 per cent. of on-licences and 3·6 of off-licences. The reduction without compensation in Scotland was just as great as the reduction with compensation in England. English Members, therefore, must not insist upon a system of compensation in Scotland, where the conditions were totally different from what they were in England. In Scotland there was never a decision like that in Sharpe *v.* Wakefield, because the law was so clear that it was not necessary to have such a decision. The English theory of the licence was fatally obscured by the experiment of the free sale of beer between 1830 and 1870. Scotland was free from that.

Magisterial discretion had always been free in Scotland. The hon. Member for the Walton Division of Liverpool had said that his remedy for the evils in Scotland was to apply to Scotland the English Act of 1904. Might he remind the hon. Member of the opinion of a Member of his own Party—Lord Balfour of Burleigh, a man whose knowledge of Scotland and whose fairness and moderation would be recognised? Lord Balfour of Burleigh, speaking on the English Licensing Act of 1904, declared that it would be a gross injustice to Scotland to extend to that country the provisions of the English Act. He explained that all Scottish licences were subject to the full discretion of the licensing authority; that the tied house system did not much exist, being checked by the Scottish magistrates, while English magistrates had no power to check it except in the case of new licences; that the practice of the Inland Revenue department was different; that it often did not charge duty on the licence at all, and might only get two and a half years purchase of the profits as against our rule of ten or twelve. He did not pretend to know what Lord Balfour's view of this Bill might be, but he was entitled to quote the distinction drawn by him between Scotland and England, and to urge that in Scotland they had a country far more like Canada, or the United States, or some eighteen of our Colonies where not one penny of compensation had ever been paid. The value of licences in Scotland was much smaller than that of licences in England. In the literature which had been circulated it was said that Victoria had compensation. Why? Because before local option was set up the licences had secured in an Act of 1885 a statutory right to renewal in set terms. That was exactly what had never been given in Scotland, and Scotland must therefore not be counted with Victoria, but with the countries which set their face against compensation. He wished to refer to the American experience. He was in the State of Maine last autumn, and his own impression was totally different from that of the hon. Member who had referred to the subject. Surely hon. Members would recognise that the conditions of Maine and of the local option States were totally different from the conditions here. In Maine they had a territory as large as Scotland, and over that the Legislature by one cast-iron statute, passed sixty years ago, prohibited for all time wholesale and retail sale, though not the importation (they had not the power to do that). Surely there was an immense difference between that local option and that which was proposed in this Bill, under which local areas would secure the privilege of no-licence with the support of public opinion behind them, and under which there would be periodical opportunities for reconsideration. If they really wished to see how things worked in America, he would refer to the State of Massachusetts, because, of all the thirty local option American States, it was the most urban and the most industrial. The density of its population was equal to that of the United Kingdom. When people said that the proposal would not work in the towns, he would not argue with such prophets—he would confidently disbelieve them. In England, we had an elaborate system of by-election significance; but the prophets were often much mistaken in the results. There had, however, been almost no experience of local option polls, but everyone was confident that local option would never be carried. Such dogmatism was, he thought, misplaced. In those parts of the United States which he visited he took the opinion of officials and police, and of the man in the street, and it was just in those very districts where local option had proved a success that people had expressed a doubt as to whether it could be carried or worked. As to the actual working of the system under urban and industrial conditions, he had only to say that it was in the towns, and not in the country districts, that during twenty-five years working of the local option law of Massachusetts most progress had been made. Taking a ten-mile radius round Boston, there was a population of 1,200,000 persons. Of these, 650,000 lived in areas under licence conditions, and 550,000 lived under no-licence conditions. There was no getting away from the fact that the people who lived in the no-licence areas supported and voted annually for the no-licence system. The central point of the experiment was perhaps the town of Cambridge, with a population of 100,000, with 13,000 weekly wage-earners, which had been for twenty years a no-licence area. During the last four years it carried no-licence by an average majority of 3,801 on an 89 per cent. poll. It had fewer prosecutions for illegal sale than the licenced city of Boston adjoining, and it had no difficulty with its clubs. As for the compensating public advantages, he had a mass of facts which justified him in stating that comparing licence with no-licence districts, and the same districts under licence and no-licence, there was a diminution shown of 66 per cent. in intemperance. The death-rate and the infantile death-rate had fallen markedly in the no-licence areas, while the increase in wealth had been marked. He asked the House, in conclusion, not to refuse to communities, who were grappling and struggling with a great source of evil and degradation, the chance of trying this no-licence system, of which there had been favourable experience in so many countries. He asked for a partition of territory between licence and no-licence areas, for some cities of refuge, for some place at all events, where a man with a drunken wife, or a wife with a drunken husband, could get away from this fatal temptation which came from thrusting the supply of alcoholic liquors on every hand upon the people. The House might think some of them over-earnest in pressing for the passing of this measure. But its advocates had followed out in imagination how much it meant in terms of human happiness for many households, and they asked that the measure should be passed because they believed that it would give assurance of deliverance in many districts, and the hope or, at worst, chance of deliverance in all.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) said he offered no apology for taking part in the debate, because, whatever he might be, he certainly was not an Englishman. His name had been on the back of a Local Veto Bill a long time before many who had spoken that day were in that House—a circumstance much to his disadvantage. In discussing this Bill they were discussing the main principles which should govern licensing reform. They had not made much progress along the lines of the principle embodied in the Bill, but he had not withdrawn his support from it in the least degree, because he regarded it as an essential part of licensing reform. The licensing reform of four years ago had helped them with regard to clubs, and, above all, it had helped them to improve and make the licensing authorities more responsible in the country. In towns they had a pretty democratic licensing body, indirectly elected and representative of the people. In the counties the licensing had been conducted by a heterogeneous mob of justices, but that had been considerably improved under the last licensing reform in Scotland. He would suggest that they could not treat Scotland like New Zealand, whether in church matters, educational matters, licensing matters, or anything else. He did not think that public opinion in Scotland would admit the prohibition or reduction of licences without the question of a time limit, at any rate, being taken into consideration. If they did not give a time limit, then they must pay some money compensation for taking away the licence immediately. Personally he had never been much of an advocate of compulsory compensation. He believed that they must give a time limit; it need not be as long as in England, because licences were sold in Scotland at something like four or five years purchase. Without the time limit, they would remove from the support of licensing reform a large mass of public opinion, and the most responsible kind of influences which they could find in the country. Therefore, he thought that the point raised by his hon. friend behind him was an essential element of licensing reform. The matter ought to be dealt with at this stage of the Bill because whatever might be their conviction as to the veto itself, as temperance reformers they must co-operate and go hand in hand if they were to overcome the dead weight of influences against them. His other point was to give the licensing authority freedom in regard to the particular manner in which they desired the local veto to be exercised. They desired to give the licensing authorities more freedom in dealing with the liquor traffic, and it was impossible to give them freedom with one hand if they held the veto in the other. He did not think they could make the veto effective unless they eliminated the element of Party politics. Under a Local Veto Bill they would stir up the liquor trade, and it would be most effective in all the referenda which were made to secure the popular voice. They must be careful how they put themselves in opposition to the liquor trade. In every election the trade was a most formidable force, and it would enter into every field where it found its predominance threatened by a Local Veto Bill. The conflict would be carried on in a most embittered manner unless they could first of all eliminate private profits; until they had done that they could not successfully apply the veto. He felt sure that a vacillating policy would be a bad policy. It had been suggested that Greenock would be a good place for prohibition; but the facilities for drinking there were very great, and that was why he should fear a vacillating policy. The only security that they had under the present system of conducting the liquor traffic for private profit lay in a very strong licensing authority, and veto without other provisions would not strengthen, but rather weaken, that authority. At the present time they were not being so much pressed to reduce licences as to grant them. Until they could secure disinterested management, he was of opinion that they could not do better than keep the licensing authorities as strong and independent as possible, and he was not at all sure that on the whole the influence of public veto would be an advantage. The disadvantages they had to deal with were the influences of the liquor interest brought to bear on local politics, and the only way in which that influence could be met was by disinterested management. Disinterested management did not enter anything on its books for goodwill; it was able to give up a licence whenever a local authority wished it; it desired to co-operate with the licensing authority and with the police; it gave no encouragement to the people to drink; the profits it made were devoted to counter attractions other than the public-house, in some other portion of the area. He did not think it was fair to judge of disinterested management by what had been done in this country. It was only when they had a monopoly over a large area that they could fairly test the system—they could then close the houses or conduct them under any regulation they liked. He was not sure that he was in favour of the municipalisation of the liquor traffic. He had no prejudice against municipal trading. But the liquor trade was about the last form of municipal trading he would desire to see. The Scandinavian system he took to be a success, but the Russian system was probably a failure. It was upon those lines they must advance if they wished to cope with the liquor evil. He was as sensible of the horrors of the liquor traffic as any prohibitionist, and if it was in his power to say that there should be prohibition of the existing system in this country, and if he thought regulations could be made stiff enough to carry out the law, he would be in favour of prohibition, because he believed that they would be better off without any alcohol at all if the traffic could be abolished. He did not, however, think it was practicable in this country, except in some very limited areas. He was heartily with those who sought to mitigate the terrible curse of drink, which was certainly as great in his own country as in any country in the world; but he was strongly of opinion that local veto by itself would be a barren proposal unless accompanied by a scheme of licensing reform. This was an opportune moment for insisting upon alternative methods being considered. Fgures in reference to the votes of Scottish Members had been given upon this subject. Personally, he had always supported local veto, but in giving their support to the principle many of them had always insisted that they regarded it as an essential part of any reform that other principles should be incorporated with it.

Mr. A. C. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston) said the hon. Member who moved the rejection of the Bill had said there was no evidence that those who lived in prohibition areas were in favour of the system. He had some experience of his own prohibition area. He had never heard of any resolution being passed against the system, even by the smallest minority, and there had never been any representations made to his agents against the system. The area contained a large population of working people, and there was plenty of evidence that they were not dissatisfied with the principle of prohibition. His hon. friend, who had some connection with a much larger area than his in the neighbourhood of Liverpool, had said that his experience was identical with his own. He could not conceive of any evidence more complete that the people were not dissatisfied with prohibition where it was carried out. In the neighbourhood to which he had referred the local authority had year by year passed a resolution asking the magistrates not to grant any new licences. In 1905 a statement was issued, signed by the President of the Local Government Board and other Members of the Government, to the effect that disinterested management established by Government had everywhere failed, whether in Russia, Norway, Sweden, or South Carolina. That statement was nowhere seriously challenged, but a good deal of light had been thrown upon it by recent experience, which showed that South Carolina had for fourteen years definitely abandoned the system; that Sweden had declared against the sale of brandy, and that Russia had about as bad a system as any country could possibly have. Before 1894 anyone in that country could start a distillery or sell spirits in any shop, and since the introduction of the new system the consumption of spirits had increased, more especially in those provinces where the monopoly had been the longest in force. The case of Norway had been quoted as an example of the success of the system, but the convictions for drunkenness showed a state of things far worse than we experienced in our own country, whilst a still wider test was to be found in the consumption of spirits. His objection to disinterested management was not based upon any abstract principle. It was his business to see that as few people were made drunk as his influence permitted. The point, however, was more for consideration in Committee than on a Second Reading, as also was the proposal for a time limit. Every Member of the House who believed that local option would bring about good results, and was likely to make people more sober, was bound to vote for the Second Reading, and reserve to themselves the right to discuss points in Committee. He ventured to think that there was a vast amount of unanimity amongst the Scottish people upon this subject. The Corporation of Glasgow had passed a resolution in its favour, the city parochial authorities had passed a similar resolution, and so had the Govan Parochial Board. So far from it being the case that a measure of this sort would not apply favourably to large towns, his belief was that the most favourable opportunity was to be found in the suburbs of our large cities. Working men ought to be able to choose some part of a town to live in where their children would be free from the temptation of the public-houses. The working classes had a right to have neighbourhoods of their own which would be immune from the drink temptation which was so injurious to themselves and to their children.

*MR. BARNARD (Kidderminster) took objection to the statement that a good many points in the Bill could be better discussed in Committee than in the House. There had been many different Resolutions passed and private Bills framed dealing with the temperance question. He thought it was essential to have some far-reaching measure instead of these piecemeal proposals which enormously complicated the question with which they were dealing. The Scottish Bill of 1903 increased democratic influence in connection with the licensing authority. In some parts it gave half of the licensing authority to the county councils or local authorities. That was a long step forward. The proposal in the Bill now before the House practically amounted to this. The population of any tiny village would be able to decide in its own area this vital and enormously important matter. While he was in favour of local control he did not think it desirable that little communities should be given powers of the far-reaching character proposed by this Bill. Legislation dealing with the liquor traffic should not be passed hastily. He reminded the House that last year the Act dealing with Sunday closing in Ireland was commended to the House because a compromise had been arrived at between the town traders and the temperance party on the question of the distance to be travelled in order to come within the definition of *bona fide* traveller. He desired at that time to speak, not against the measure generally, but on that particular point. The application of the closure prevented him from stating what he wanted to say, and he voted against the Bill on the ground that it had not been sufficiently discussed. Immediately afterwards the newspaper for which the hon. Member for the

Appleby Division was responsible announced with great prominence how he had voted, and stated that temperance men should lose no time in expressing disapproval of his action. He hoped the promoters of this Bill would be tolerant of the views held by others who, while desiring the same end, did not regard the machinery now proposed as that which was most likely to achieve the wished-for result. He was not in Parliament through the support of the great trade organisations of the country. He had promised nothing to any temperance society, and yet he had the National Trade Defence Association denouncing him and going in favour of his opponent. That gave him a title to speak with some degree of impartiality. The whole difficulty on this question arose in connection with compensation. The supporters of the Bill had not touched that matter, and it would be interesting to know what was the real meaning they attached to the term "time limit." If they would state what it meant, he believed that would go a long way towards solving the question. Both the majority and the minority Reports of the Royal Commission presided over by Lord Peel agreed in stating that something should be done for persons whose interests were affected by the reduction of licences. The whole crux of the matter was a fair consideration of the interests of the people involved, and if only they could be dealt with in a more or less generous spirit he believed they would rapidly get reform which everyone desired to see, whereas disregard of the personal interests would inevitably delay the solution.

*MR. SHERWELL (Huddersfield) said that one's view of legislation was necessarily determined by the object which was in view. Many persons were accustomed to regard the problem of intemperance as one of drunkenness. In his view that estimate was neither adequate nor satisfactory. If the problem before politicians and reformers was merely the reduction or suppression of flagrant drunkenness, the problem to be solved would lie in very much smaller compass, for after all the number of habitual drunkards was comparatively small and they formed but an insignificant proportion of the total population. His own point of view was probably not the point of view of the ordinary temperance reformer, or of the ordinary advocate of licensing reform. He approached the question from a strictly economic point of view, being chiefly impressed by the economic waste and danger represented by the average expenditure of the people on alcoholic drinks. When it was realised that the average expenditure of the working classes of the country as a whole was not less than 6s. per week per family, the House would see how serious was the strictly economic aspect of the question. The high and unnecessary expenditure upon alcohol was the real measure of the gravity of the problem. With the principle underlying the Bill he was in hearty agreement; its provisions were, in his opinion, unnecessarily limited, but they represented an extension of the democratic principle of local self-government, and on that ground alone they were entitled to favourable consideration. He believed that there was no sound reason in logic for withholding the principle of local control from the conduct of the liquor trade, and certainly the admission of the principle in other forms of political and administrative procedure constituted precedents which they were logically bound to follow. The real defect of the Bill, in his opinion, was that it unduly restricted the proposed extension of the democratic principle. He believed that the admission of the principle of local self-government carried with it the necessity of other powers and options than those included in the provisions of the Bill. The principle of the Bill was embodied in two main provisions, the first of which was concerned with the reduction of licences in accordance with local opinion. Personally he was not so much enamoured of the reduction of licences as a remedy as were others whose judgment was entitled to full respect. He recognised the desirability that there should be few licences rather than many, both for the lessening of temptation and for the purposes of more effective police supervision. Nevertheless, he believed that its value as an instrument of reform had been much exaggerated. It was to be remembered that the diminution in the amount of alcohol sold and consumed was never in proportion to the reduction of licences effected. A large part of the trade formerly done in the suppressed houses was always diverted to the remaining houses, which consequently had to be enlarged to admit of the greater volume of trade. That had been the experience of Birmingham and elsewhere, where extension of premises had necessarily followed suppression of superfluous licences. Within the last half-century there had been a considerable reduction in the number of public-houses in Scotland, but there had been no corresponding diminution in the amount of alcohol consumed. Despite the difference in the number of licences, the amount of spirits consumed per head of the population in Scotland had remained practically stationary, and was only fractionally less at the present time than it was half a century ago. While admitting the advantages of legislation for the compulsory reduction of licences where there was an excessive supply, he did not regard such legislation as properly the first step to be taken. In considering the present excess in the number of licensed premises and the steps to be taken to effect a reduction, they must have regard to the causes which had produced the excess. In his judgment the true remedy lay not so much in legislation or in administration as in the just application of economic forces. The excess in the number of licensed premises had arisen from the fact of wholly inadequate taxation. Originally our licensing system was a free trade system, and licences were issued on a free trade basis. Gradually, however, the evil consequences of unrestricted traffic in liquor began to be realised, and Parliament had busied itself throughout the centuries in imposing restrictions, the effect of which had ultimately been to transform our licensing system from a free trade system into a close monopoly with full monopoly privileges. Parliament, however, while transforming the character of a licence, had never adjusted taxation to the change in the character of the licence, and, consequently, had failed to exact from the licensee a payment in any way commensurate with the value of the privilege conferred. In his judgment the first step to be taken to bring about a substantial reduction in the number of licences was to apply the economic check of adequate taxation. The value of such a check had already been powerfully illustrated in the case of Scotland. Prior to 1880, the sum paid for a publican's licence in Scotland was almost insignificant. In that year, however, Mr. Gladstone recast and increased the publican's licence duties. The increase, it was true, was quite inadequate, but its immediate effect was to bring about the surrender of something like 4,000 publican's licences in Scotland. For his own part, therefore, he would have preferred to postpone legislation for the compulsory reduction of licences until after a revision and increase of the licence duties. The other main provision of the Bill was the much more controverted one of local veto. Personally he had always been favourable to the principle of local veto, and was prepared to support its inclusion in a comprehensive measure of licensing reform, but he differed from some of his hon. friends in his estimate of the results to be expected from it. Speaking from his investigations and study of the working of prohibitory laws in all parts of the world, he ventured to suggest to the House that there was no evidence to show that local veto, if enacted, would solve the problem of intemperance in those great urban communities in the country where the problem most pressed for solution. It had been mentioned in the course of the debate that there were many areas in the United Kingdom where prohibition was already established by the will of the landlord, but he submitted to the House that no sound deduction could be drawn from those in support of the expectation that local veto would be effective under the provisions of this Bill in ordinary urban areas. The districts referred to were chiefly respectable residential areas in close proximity to licensed areas. Indeed the boundaries in many cases were wholly artificial. People who went to live in them went there knowing that prohibition was already imposed, and therefore aware of the existing condition of things. In the cases contemplated by the Bill, however, the proposal was to enforce prohibition by the will of a majority in districts where licensed houses already existed. In the case of Toxteth Park, to which reference had been made, it had to be remembered that abundant facilities for the purchase of liquor existed in adjacent districts. He was not depreciating the value or advantages of these prohibition areas. On the contrary, he welcomed them, but he thought it right to suggest that they could not fairly be pressed so far as they sometimes were pressed as arguments for local veto elsewhere. They depended very largely for their success upon the existence of a "safety-valve" in the shape of facilities for the purchase of liquor in closely adjacent areas. The hon. Member for Partick, who had moved the Second Reading of the Bill, in adverting to the objection that these adjoining areas frequently suffered from an excessive number of public-houses as a consequence of no licence in the prohibition areas, had suggested that under the Bill these licence areas had the remedy in their own hands, but he apparently did not appreciate the fact that if these areas were themselves to adopt prohibition in self-defence they would in that way destroy the "safety-valve" upon which the success of present experiments in prohibition in adjoining areas largely depended. In the course of the debate considerable stress had been laid upon the success of local veto in the United States and in the British Colonies, but the experience of those countries simply confirmed doubts of the practicability of local veto in large urban communities. Undoubtedly both in the United States and in the British Colonies local veto had been successful in sparsely-peopled districts, but it had not solved the problem of the towns. His hon. friend the Member for Lincoln had referred particularly to Massachusetts and to the no-licence areas in that State, but he ventured to point out to him and to the House that the urban areas under prohibition there were chiefly suburbs of Boston, and, in the judgment of those responsible for the no-licence campaign in Massachusetts, were dependent for their success upon the safety-valve afforded by the adjoining licence districts. His hon. friend had referred to Cambridge, a city of about 100,000 inhabitants, but Cambridge was to all intents and purposes a part of Boston, although administratively separate. It was impossible for a stranger to say where Boston ended and Cambridge began. It was true, as his hon. friend had said, that the people of Cambridge had for twenty years given a majority for no-licence, but if his hon. friend had analysed the vote in the separate wards of the city, he would have seen that whereas the University and superior residential districts which principally comprise the city had consistently voted for prohibition, the poorer industrial districts had year after year voted for licence, although their votes had been overborne by the votes of the residents in the better class districts. It might be suggested that such coercion of the working class wards would not arise under the provisions of the Bill now before the House. That was true, but did hon. Members appreciate the fact that the admission really involved an admission of the ineffectiveness of the Bill in the districts which most required attention? If local veto was not likely to be adopted in ordinary working class areas or in urban communities, then clearly some other method of reform was required which would offer a half-way house before the goal of entire prohibition was ultimately reached. It was for this reason that he, and others with whom it was his privilege to act, advocated permissive experiments in what was known as disinterested management The alleged failure of disinterested management in other countries had been emphasised in strong terms by the hon. Member for the Tradeston Division of Glasgow who had referred particularly to the Government spirit monopoly in Russia, the State dispensary system in South Carolina, and the so-called Gothenburg system in Sweden and Norway. He (Mr. Sherwell) held no brief for the system of State monopoly either in Russia or elsewhere. He and his friends had always pointed out the limitations and defects of any form of Government monopoly, and had repeatedly emphasised the fact that where, as in Russia, the Government had power to open dramshops in any locality without regard to local opinion the system was fore-doomed to failure. Nevertheless much of the criticism that had been directed against the Russian spirit monopoly was misleading. The figures showing the revenue from the monopoly, for example, were constantly used without regard to the facts, first, that the adoption of the system had been gradual and that, consequeatly, as it was extended to new areas the volume of trade naturally increased; and, secondly, that under the former system the Government received excise duties which now were included in what were called the profits of the monopoly, and their inclusion naturally swelled the so-called profits, and suggested an extraordinary increase in the amount of spirits consumed. Nor was the hon. Member justified in stating that the dispensary system in South Carolina had on account of its failure been abolished. It had merely been abolished as a State system, but had been re-enacted in the much more satisfactory form of a local option system under which the dangers of centralisation would be eliminated. The hon. Member in referring to Sweden had implied that the system of disinterested management there had so far failed as to call forth commendation from the Swedish Parliament. As a matter of fact the Swedish Parliament had recently given the most explicit evidence of its approval of the system by enacting legislation which came into operation in the present year extending the system to the rural districts from which it had hitherto been excluded. Such action was surely an emphatic endorsement of the merits of the system on the part of the Swedish Parliament. The hon. Member for the Tradeston division had laid great stress upon the arrests for drunkeness in Norway and Sweden, and had used those arrests as conclusive evidence of the failure of the Gothenburg system He (Mr. Sherwell) was always sorry when temperance reformers based arguments on comparative statistics of drunkenness. Nothing could be more misleading than a test of that kind. It was certainly true that the arrests for drunkenness in some Norwegian and Swedish towns were high as compared with similar towns in England, but if the hon. Member suggested that that was a test of failure, then he could not limit the test to the system of disinterested management, but must in fairness apply the test to other methods of dealing with the liquor traffic also. For example, there were two towns in Norway which in point of population, economic and geographical conditions were fairly comparable, namely, Bergen and Stavanger. In Bergen the system of disinterested management was in force as regards spirits, whereas since 1896 Stavanger had been under prohibition in regard to spirits. Taking the last quinquennial period he found that the arrests for drunkenness in ratio to population had been higher in Stavanger under prohibition than in Bergen under disinterested management. Did this therefore imply that prohibition was a failure? Or again, he would take Portland, the principal city in the State of Maine, which had been under prohibition for nearly sixty years. During the last ten years the arrests for drunkenness in Portland had averaged thirty-four per 1,000 of the population, or four times the ratio of arrests in Liverpool, and slightly more than four times the ratio of arrests in London. Would the hon. Member suggest that these figures necessarily implied the failure of prohibition, a system which he himself advocated? Surely if statistics of drunkenness were made the evidence of failure in the case of disinterested management, they must also be made the evidence of failure in the case of prohibition. Suggestions of failure in the case of disinterested management could only arise from a misconception of what the Gothenburg system really was. It was not an abstraction, but the amalgamation of various restrictions, each of which had been advocated by the hon. Member for Tradeston and his friends all their lives. Its principal features were the elimination of the inducement to sell liquor, the reduction of the number of public-houses, the shortening of the hours of sale, the non-employment of barmaids, the raising of the age limit for children and young persons, the abolition of sales on credit, and other similar provisions. Was it really to be seriously suggested that these restrictions actually aggravated the evil of intemperance? Let him take the case of Bergen to which reference had been made. It was incontestable that under the system of disinterested management the bar sales of spirits had been considerably reduced. Was the House to understand that this reduction in the bar sales of spirits had actually increased the amount of drunkenness? If such deductions were to be drawn, then clearly the hon. Member for Tradeston was logically bound to renounce the advocacy of all restrictions of the liquor traffic, and to oppose that which he had hitherto supported. He wished in closing to express his regret that the Bill contained no provision for the enactment of a time limit which would clear the ground for such experiments as the people desired. It was perfectly true, as had been suggested that afternoon, that there was no vested interest in licences in Scotland, and therefore no claim in legal equity to compensation; but those who were students of political procedure in this country knew that the legislative solution of such problems was not founded so much on legal equity or on an abstract principle of justice, as upon a broad sentiment of justice which largely determined public action. Everyone who had studied the question knew that it was impossible to clear the ground and secure complete liberty for experiments in different localities until they had resolutely faced as a matter of practical politics this question of assumed vested interests, and he thought that the promoters of the Bill would best advance the cause they had in view if in Committee they would include in its provisions an equitable time limit for definitely ridding the country of the compensation difficulty.

Mr. BOTTOMLEY (Hackney, S.) said he did not consider it necessary simply because the measure before the House referred solely to Scotland to offer any apology for intervening in the discussion. Scotland was part of the United Kingdom, and so long as that remained the fact he would feel it his duty on all occasions to do everything in his power to promote the interests of his Celtic neighbours. He would like seriously to express the hope that neither the mover nor the seconder of this Bill nor any of its supporters would suspect that because some hon. Members on that side of the House were utterly opposed to such legislation they were in any way behind them in a desire for temperance reform. It would be mere affectation for any man to pretend that he did not realise the gravity and solemnity of the evil with which temperance reformers were endeavouring to grapple. But their differences were fundamental. If he might say so without appearing disrespectful to the projectors of this measure, he would suggest that the mistake they made was in endeavouring to introduce into the deliberations of apurely political assembly such as the House of Commons considerations and arguments of an evangelical character. One hon. Member introduced a measure for Sunday closing, saying he had found the principles of the Gospel so successful in various other callings of life that it was his intention to introduce them into Parliament. The hon. Member who introduced the Bill used the argument that they must do their best to see that the petition, "Lead us not into temptation," was not infringed by their legislation. He ventured to say that such arguments placed the opponents of measures of this kind in an invidious and unfair position. In reply to hon. Members who told them that the Bible was to be the rule of faith and conduct in all public affairs, one would be justified in quoting passage after passage from that same Book, every word of which was antagonistic to any kind of legislation which had for its object the restriction of the liberty of every citizen to indulge in alcoholic refreshment to his heart's content. [Laughter.] That phrase was received with a levity for which he was not responsible. He preferred to base his opposition to this measure upon the simple, practical, political ground that, tested by experience, logic, and fact, restrictive legislation never had—in any part of the United Kingdom, at any rate—had any beneficial effect. There was no argument, and there were no statistics which supported the theory that restrictive legislation had ever promoted temperance. England without any restrictive licensing legislation in regard to early closing was a more sober country to-day than either Scotland, Wales or Ireland. He made himself responsible for that general statement based upon some investigation into the subject. England was every year becoming a more sober country, whereas, tested by statistical facts, Scotland was becoming a less sober country. In England to-day the proportion of drunkenness was 6 per 1,000 in Scotland it was 9 per 1,000. He asked any hon. Member for Scotland to disprove that statement. He went further, and said that, whereas during the last twenty years the figures confronting them in England had been steadily decreasing, those in Scotland showed an increase of 50 per cent. He did not think there was much good to be gained by going into these details and statistics. They had to look at the matter from the point of view of their knowledge of the world. He ventured to say the evil of drunkenness, great as it was, was grossly—perhaps unconsciously—exaggerated by those who made it the main purpose of their lives to grapple with it. But whatever its extent might be he was satisfied that no amount of closing of public-houses in any given district would have the effect of preventing the man who intended to be intemperate from gratifying his desires. Looking at Scotland and Wales, they would find that was beyond question. They would find secret drinking, bogus clubs, and—what to him was the greatest danger of this legislation —home drinking to an extent which was absolutely unknown in those areas where such legislation did not exist. He would rather see one hundred men drunk in the public-house than one drunken man among his family and his children. [Cries of "Oh, oh."] He said that with deliberation aud seriously. [A LABOUR MEMBER: Where do they go to when they leave the pub?] He had yet to learn that a large percentage of men left the public-house in that condition, and that the licensed victualler in his own interest did not do his utmost to see that no man became intoxicated on his premises. But assuming that every man who got drunk did so in the public-house, and went home in that condition, was it not better that he should do so when his confiding wife alone was up, and the members of his family were retired to rest, than that he should be sipping and sipping in the midst of his innocent family, and setting himself to defy the State, saying: "If you wish to prevent me doing that which I have a right to do, I will show you you are not going to succeed?" Was it not a remarkable fact that throughout this discussion not a speaker in favour of the Bill had pretended that in the majority or minority Reports of the Royal Commission there was one word in favour of local veto? He thought that was an overwhelming fact.

AN HON. MEMBER said that a large measure of popular control was specially recommended.

MR. BOTTOMLEY said he did not maintain that there was no suggestion that after five years Scotland should have a large measure of local control, but that in the Report there was no recommendation of the general principle of local veto. A reference to the Report would justify his assertion.

*MR. CHARLES ROBERTS said there could be no doubt that in the case of Scotland local option was recommended.

MR. BOTTOMLEY said that a reference to both Reports would show that they avoided recommendation of the principle. He had not found that recommendation, and he was surprised that up to the present no speaker had found it and read it. He was struck by the fact that when the Irish Sunday Closing measure was before the House a large number of hon. Members who were avowed total abstainers declared themselves thoroughly opposed to legislation of this kind. If the House looked at the figures for Scotland, it would be driven to the conclusion that prohibition in Scotland had been a dismal failure. It was said that statistics could prove anything. In future that would have to be modified by saying that statistics could prove anything in the world except that restrictive licensing legislation had ever done an atom of good for temperance reform. Here were the figures of drunkenness for the city of Glasgow, taken from the records of the Scottish courts:—13,456 in 1904, 14,931 in 1905, and 20,247 in 1906. That was with such prohibition as they had to-day. A startling fact which he commended to the attention of the House was that in those places where there was the largest number of public-houses the statistics of crime and drunkenness were in an inverse ratio to the number of public-houses. No doubt hon. Members would have difficulty in believing that, but the official statistics showed it to be the case. Again, he commended to the notice of the House the argument that drunkenness *per se* was not the great evil that temperance reformers would wish the community to believe. Only a limited number of persons suffered from the disease, and the main point in respect of this legislation was to consider on what ground hon. Members could claim the right to legislate and to say that three-fifths of a community, with a limited franchise, should be endowed with the power to say that the remainder of the community should not have facilities to take liquor. The right claimed could only be justified on the one ground that the consumption of alcohol was a pestilence and a curse condemned by the general opinion the whole community. If that was the case, how could hon. Members pressing forward this legislation justify the taking of more than £30,000,000 annually for the use of the public services from the liquor trade? If the argument of the temperance reformers was that drinking was such a pestilence in the common judgment of the whole community as justified a three fifths majority, with a limited franchise, preventing any one from touching drink, it must then be a serious thing for them to rely on the entire expenses of the Army, Navy, and Civil Services being paid out of the taxes derived from the revenue from drink. He reminded hon. Members of what took place when the Liberal Party tampered with this question not many years ago. The Liberal Party was shattered and vanquished by attempting to force this un-English measure on the English people. He was not fond of quoting Latin, but he remembered that one of the sixpenny appendix phrases that he got from a dictionary was *Fiat experimentum in corpore vili.* He knew very well that the phrase meant this, "Try this experiment, if you like, on the vile *corpus* of the Scottish people, and if it succeeds, perhaps we can keep the English people waiting a little longer." 134 out of 150 Liberal candidates were defeated at that election, and they attributed their defeat to local veto. Were hon. Members on his own side of the House going in these early days of revived Liberalism to run the risk of shattering their party again? A great demand was being made on the Party loyalty of the Government supporters who wished to act up to their election pledges, but as one who knew human nature he could not bring himself to believe that legislation of this kind was calculated to do any good whatever. He was always anxious to avoid anything in the nature of an artificial peroration, but he would like to quote the words which Sir William Harcourt uttered during the Oxford election of 1873, which contained a most eloquent denunciation of legislation of the kind now proposed. That distinguished statesman said—

> "If there be one Party which is more pledged than another to resist a policy of restrictive legislation having for its object social coercion, that Party is the Liberal Party. The proud title which it has assumed proclaims the principle on which it is founded to be that of liberty. The connection between Liberalism and liberty is that liberty, as understood by Liberals, does not consist in making others do what you think right. The difference between a free Government and a Government which is not free is principally this: that a Government which is not free interferes with everything it can, and a free Government interferes with nothing except what it must. A despotic Government tries to make everybody do what it chooses. A Liberal Government tries, as far as the safety of society will permit, to allow everybody to do as he wishes. It has been the tradition of the Liberal Party consistently to maintain the doctrine of individual liberty. It is because they have done so that England is the country where people can do more what they please than in any other country in the world. The Liberal Party has strenuously and successfully laboured for generations to break down all systems of restrictions—restrictions of commerce, restrictions of political rights, restrictions of opinion, restrictions of religion, all founded and established by people who sincerely believed that these restrictions were to the advantage of society, by compelling people to do what they could for themselves and for their neighbours. It is this practice of allowing one set of people to dictate to another set of people what they shall do, what they shall think, what they shall drink, when they shall go to bed, what they shall buy and where they shall buy it, what wages they shall get and how they shall spend them, against which the Liberal Party have always protested. The policy of the Liberal Party has been for generations a policy of emancipation from restriction. I am against the whole system of petty molestation and irritating dictation, whether by a class or by a majority. I do not admire the grand maternal Government which ties night-caps upon a grown-up nation by Act of Parliament. I am against putting people to bed who want to sit up. I am against forbidding a man to have a glass of beer if he wants to have a glass of beer. These are not actions of a Liberal policy, for they are the negation of the principle of liberty. One set of people want to attack liberty of action in one respect, another set of people want to attack it in another respect; some people want to dictate the conduct of employers, others to impose terms on the employed. Some want to meddle with the rights of the owners of public-houses; others to invade the rights of the owners of private houses. The form is different, but the error is the same. Unless we resolutely make a stand against this sort of thing, depend upon it liberty itself will suffer. Tyranny is a weed which is indigenous to the soil of power alike at all times and in all places. We have limited the Crown, we have limited the aristocracy, and depend upon it, if liberty is to be sacred, a democratic House of Commons must know how to limit itself. The Liberal Party, having won liberty for the English people, if need be, will yet defend it from the assaults of democratic despotism."

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire) said the duty he had to discharge was to inform the House of the attitude of the Government in regard to the measure. It was no part of his duty to travel over the large field which had been traversed that afternoon. All of them in Scotland recognised, and not least those who had to deal with the administration of Scottish business, such as the prisons, asylums, and other institutions of the country, that this evil in Scotland was of terrible dimensions, and it was obvious, if they were to seek the remedies for that evil, they must at any rate have the sympathy and support of the majority of the Scottish people. There was no doubt whatever as to the condition of Scottish opinion in regard to the Bill. Over and over again the opinion of the House had been taken upon Bills embodying the principle this Bill contained, and over and over again an overwhelming number of Scottish Members had voted in its favour. This was the sixth time during the last twenty-six or twenty-seven years that a measure embodying the principle of local veto had been discussed and voted upon in the House. He would give the House the voting of the Scottish Members. In 1880 a majority of the Scottish representatives by thirty-eight to three voted in favour of the principle; in 1881 the majority was thirty-seven to three; in 1888 it was thirty-six to three; and in 1899 it was forty to fifteen. It was therefore clear that Scottish people and Scottish opinion generally sought protection from this evil, and asked for the right to apply the principle of local control. On behalf of the Government he had simply to say that they heartily supported the principle of the Bill. The Bill itself left much to be desired, not only in regard to what was in it, but in regard to what was not in it. The Bill, the Government hoped, might be read a second time, the effect of which would be that it would go to the Scottish Standing Committee. With regard to that stage the Government would reserve to themselves full liberty of action, and they must not be considered as being committed to any of the details of the measure, as they at present stood, or to the view that it could be made a practical measure of reform. But so far as lay within their power they wished to co-operate in advancing the question a stage during the present session, and to do what they could to make it a practical measure, whatever its fate might be, in the lifetime of the present Parliament.

*MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said that he noticed that three of the hon. Members opposite who were going to vote against the Amendment now before the House had spoken of the necessity for the insertion in the Bill of the principle of compensation. He need hardly say that hon. Members on that side of the House were in agreement with that proposal, but the ideas of the Opposition as to the form in which compensation might be inserted in the Bill were of a different kind. Hon. Members opposite suggested the insertion of a time limit, but in his opinion and in that of those who acted with him such a limit would not in any sense form a proper method of compensation. It would be impossible for the licensee who was given notice of the termination of his licence, even in seven, fourteen, or twenty-one years to recoup himself for his capital and means of living. Indeed, he would go so far as to say that many owners of licences would prefer to be robbed of their property at once rather than have hanging over their heads for such a long period the danger of ultimate ruin. Some of them were now at a time of life at which they could start afresh and secure their future and that of their families, whereas if they waited they would not at the expiration of the time limit be able to do so. They knew quite well that if this principle was adopted for Scotland it would doubtless be extended to England, and therefore as Englishmen they had a right to be heard. Many speakers had said that the conscience of the country was uneasy at the number of public-houses. If that were so, by all means let them remove the evil, but to propose to remove it, as the Bill did, at the expense of their neighbours' pockets was taking a step in the direction of doing evil in order that good might come. It was not right that the public conscience should be soothed at the expense of other people's property. He also felt that what was proposed was an intolerable piece of tyranny—that a relatively small number of persons should have a right to say that no one should have a glass of intoxicating liquor, but must drink the particular beverage which they thought desirable. He did not think people south of the Tweed would tolerate such a thing for a moment. He had no personal interest in the liquor traffic, and he had been a water drinker for the last thirty years, but he had never found other persons insisting that he should take another form of beverage, and therefore he did not desire to force water upon them. Then again, another objectionable feature was that the whole question was to be revised every three years. That meant that the present holders of licences would be robbed of their property and means of livelihood without compensation, and yet after a few years the whole question was to be reopened. One result of that would be that should the decision of a locality be reversed, the present high type of licence-holder would not again be found to re-enter so precarious a calling, and the traffic would pass into the hands of those who would have no pride in the good conduct of their houses, and who would feel no interest in the welfare of their customers. Then there was no provision dealing with clubs. Those who knew anything of large and populous districts were aware that drinking clubs were the worse means of supplying liquor. They were under no kind of control by either the magistrates or police, and were nothing more nor less, many of them, than drinking hells. He did not believe the people of Scotland, with the examples of Edinburgh and Glasgow before them, wanted the Bill, because the magistrates had already been given more power than the justices in this country to refuse the renewal of licences. At present, under the Scottish system, the people had a direct voice in the appointment of the borough magistrates. The proposed legislation would operate almost exclusively upon the poor man, which was not at all right. If the measure proposed to deal with the question upon lines of adequate compensation without differentiating between rich and poor it would be more likely to commend itself to the public and to hon. Members on his side of the House. Then there was the methylated spirit evil, which was on the increase, and no attempt to deal with it was contained in the Bill. In conclusion he declared that the Bill would lead to sly drinking through the medium of chemists' shops and other ways. It would, moreover, be a great hardship to the travelling public. For these reasons, and because he believed the force of public opinion was travelling surely in the direction of greater habits of sobriety, he would certainly support the Amendment.

*MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.), on behalf of himself and his Welsh colleagues, cordially supported the principle of the Bill. Wales had taken for many years a great interest in this question, and on two occasions a Welsh Local Veto Bill had passed a Second Reading. In 1891, in a Conservative House of Commons, a Welsh Local Veto Bill passed its Second Reading and on that occasion only one Welsh representative voted against it. In 1893 substantially the same measure was read a second time and only two Welsh Members voted against it. If now they had a Welsh Local Veto Bill before the House he thought he might say that it would have the support of every Member from Wales. Reference had been made to the Licensing Commission, of which he had the honour of being a member, and he would like to make clear the fact that a specific recommendation was made on the point involved in this Bill. In the Chairman's Report it was pointed out that in Scotland and Wales the case was different from that of England, and in those countries the cause of temperance reform was in a much more advanced stage than it was here. The Commission suggested that at the end of five years in Scotland and seven years in Wales a wide measure of this character might be applied to those countries. In many ways, indeed, the result of that Commission had been the foundation of all temperance reform, because the House had passed some of its most important declarations. That was a good augury for this Bill and indicated, that in some form the principle of it, as far as Scotland was concerned, would soon become the law of the land. There were certain difficulties with regard to the application of local veto to England which were not applicable to Scotland, and therefore there was a reason for dealing with legislation for Scotland in advance of legislation for England. He had been much interested to gather from the debate the strength of Scottish opinion upon this point, not only from what was said by the mover and seconder but from the weight of Scottish opinion in Scotland itself. It would be a great advantage in dealing with the question throughout the country that the experiment should be tried in Scotland, and in his opinion it was most gratifying that the Government, through the Secretary for Scotland, had announced their decision in favour of the principle of the Bill. He had been referred to as one who had more responsibility than any one else in the House in regard to the application of the principle of local veto to large building areas. He was responsible for working a considerable area in Liverpool in which the sale of drink was prohibited, and he would like to corroborate what had been said as to the beneficial working of the principle. He had never received a petition, or resolution, or a protest, nor had his firm, from any one living in that area, and speaking from his experience as a business man, he was glad to say that nothing but good had come from the application of that principle in the area for which he was responsible, and the social and moral welfare of the people in those districts was higher than it was elsewhere. After all, practical experience was very valuable in the solution of a question of this kind. He was not disposed to take a very sanguine view as to the possibilities of legislation, but he was sure that if the principle of this Bill were applied in England, Scotland, and Wales, it would bring nothing but good into the life of the nation, and that the present Parliament, however remarkable its achievements might be in other directions, could not do better than pass this Bill.

*MR. YOUNGER (Ayr Burghs) said that he had been connected with the brewing trade in Scotland all his life, but the system in Scotland was different from that in England, and being what was called a free trade brewer, he owned no houses, so that his interest was only indirect, and was limited to any possible dislocation of the ordinary channels of distribution. He was convinced that although Scotland was said to be ripe for this change and desired it, the restriction of the sale of liquor would increase consumption rather than decrease it. He had had a fairly good experience of Parliamentary contests, but he had never found out that Scotland wanted local control. It had always appeared to him that at elections the question was treated as a joke, and that there was no serious intention behind it except on the part of extreme temperance reformers. They had an importance out of all proportion to their numbers, because they were the balancing factor in many constituencies, and it was on account of their votes that Members had been compelled to pledge themselves to this principle. There was, he submitted, less excuse now than there had been in previous years for interference with the existing system. He also had the privilege of sitting on the Royal Commission, in consequence of whose Report many changes had been made in Scotland. They had an interesting Bill passed in 1903 which amended and consolidated the whole of the laws relating to the licensing system in Scotland, and constituted the licensing boards on a democratic basis. So far as he had himself been able to judge, those boards were working admirably, and were giving great satisfaction. The system appeared to be one which did not, as far as he could see, require any change or improvement. He did not on personal grounds make any objection to the proposal of his hon. friend opposite, unless he was to take the first clause of his Bill as meaning that brewers in the prohibited areas were not to be allowed to deal in a wholesale way. That, he understood, was not intended by the Bill, but he wished to have the point made clear, as it was not at all clear in the Bill, which was so clumsily drafted that he thought it would be impossible for any Committee to deal with it properly. When the Royal Commission was sitting they had under cross-examination a very extreme teetotal witness, who was asked whether, as he would prohibit the sale of drink in a given area, he would prohibit its manufacture there as well as its importation. His answer was in the affirmative, and his cross-examiner then said, "And you would place that power in the hands of the majority," and pointed out how that might cut both ways. One objection to the Bill was its restrictive character. They already had enough restriction in Scotland, and the latest attempt had not been a brilliant success, for the shortening of hours of opening in Edinburgh and Glasgow had apparently not tended to greater sobriety in those two cities. There could be no doubt that the people in Edinburgh and Glasgow did not go to bed at ten o'clock at night any more than did the people in London; they got their supplies outside public-houses, where there was no restriction, and consequently drinking went on to greater excess than formerly. In connection with the recommendation in Lord Peel's Minority Report the House might be interested to know that it did not exactly embody Lord Peel's view on the subject of local veto. Part 5 was never considered by the Commission as a whole, as the unfortunate difference of opinion between Lord Peel and his colleagues on the neutral panel had arisen on the administrative portion of the Report and occasioned his Lordship's withdrawal. While he would have cleared up the misunderstanding on the part of the hon. Member for South Hackney as to the recommendations in the Minority Report if the previous speaker had not done so, he had no doubt the House would notice that while a measure of popular control, under proper safeguards, was recommended, the nature of these safeguards was not suggested. In point of fact Part 5 as originally submitted to the Commission contained Lord Peel's matured view of what these safeguards should be, and it would interest the House to be placed in possession of his recommendations. They were as follows—

> "The licensing authority should be empowered on a requisition of a certain proportion of the ratepayers to take a poll of the ratepayers on two questions.
>
> "1. Do you prefer the present system or prohibition of on-drinking houses (hotels and restaurants excepted)?
>
> "2 Do you prefer the present system, or local management?
>
> "We think that a three-fourths majority of the registered electors should be required to carry prohibition, and a two-thirds majority to carry local management. In the unlikely event of both being carried by the required majorities that with the larger vote would of course carry the day. To avoid danger of fluctuations a vote should be taken not oftener than once in seven years. In case of local management being adopted the local authority should decide how far it should extend its operations. It should be carefully laid down that not more than a certain percentage of profits should be devoted to local objects entirely unconnected with the rates."

He could not of course tell what had happened, but he conjectured that Lord Peel had to cut out his view as to the necessary safeguards in order to secure adhesion to his Report by those Commissioners who had continued to act with him, otherwise he would have had to face the risk of standing alone.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I think I ought to say the hon. Member is incorrect in his assumption that the members who signed the Minority Report did not concur in the whole of their recommendation.

*MR. YOUNGER said he did not suggest that. What he did suggest was that Lord Peel modified his original Report to meet the views of the other members of the minority. Then there was the question of the franchise. With reference to the poll to be taken under the Bill, the parish council register was perhaps the widest they had in Scotland; but that franchise was not nearly wide enough, as it would cut out a great number of persons who ought to be heard on a question of this kind. He would also like to point out in discussing the question of compensation that the Bill proposed to hand over the distribution of liquor in the prohibited areas to the local chemists, and he rather thought there would be a great many chemists established if the Bill passed. He believed that Scotsmen would be just as clever in evading the law as people in other places. In America it was very easy to obtain a doctor's prescription, and he thought it would be as easy in Scotland. He remembered reading of one place in America where the doctors began to make some difficulty about prescribing, and at last a very ingenious person imported a pet snake into the locality, with the result that there was no difficulty in getting a prescription if a person could show he had been bitten by that snake. The only difficulty was to secure the services of the snake, as it was necessary to book it three or four weeks in advance.

He had listened to the half-hearted commendation of the Bill by the Secretary for Scotland, and he regarded the right hon. Gentleman's statement really as an entire condemnation of the manner in which the Bill had been drawn and the provisions it proposed to enact. Under the circumstances, he asked if it was wise or fair to introduce a novel proposal of this kind, and endeavour to base it on a sure foundation upstairs, when the Secretary for Scotland certainly by implication had condemned it. The Government ought to deal with the question themselves, and he did not think it was right or statesmanlike to send such a Bill to the Scottish Grand Committee for the purpose of having it knocked into shape.

*SIR JOHN JARDINE (Roxburghshire) said it seemed to him that most of the objections raised on the Bill could be dealt with by the Committee upstairs. Scotland had by its representatives endorsed the principles of the Bill in this and the last Parliament. They were approved by the serious and religious people of Scotland, and he had no doubt that if the Bill were passed into law it would be administered, in the rural districts with every regard for the wishes and welfare of the people, so careful and efficient were the elected Boards.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said he would not have risen but for the boldness of the hon. Member for Dumfries in declaring that no Member on that side would be prepared to oppose the principle of the Bill. It was scarcely possible, after such a statement, that they who were distinctly opposed to the Bill in its entirety should refrain from putting their views before the House. They had heard some curious explanations of the views of hon. Members opposite, and they had been allowed to see that at least there was a very wide difference of opinion on that side of the House. Perhaps the most candid of all statements made by Members opposite was that of the hon. Member for West Denbighshire, who had calmly asked them to make the experiment with regard to Scotland. Was anything ever addressed to Scottish Members with more calm assurance than that the doubts as to the application of the principle to England should be solved by making the experiment upon the unfortunate body of Scotland? He asked the House to notice in the first place how far they were going to apply this principle of a popular vote. Were they quite certain what the effect in every case and in every district would be? Hon. Members opposite seemed to take it for granted that it would be almost universally either limitation or prohibition. The effect of the voting, however, was quite uncertain, but if it resulted as was expected by the authors of the Bill, there was the great danger that it would drive the evil into hidden corners, and it would still go on without the necessary restrictions and police supervision now exercised over public-houses. He wondered if hon. Members who spoke so bitterly of public-houses were in the habit of reading the exposures of what went on in some of the poorer tenements of Glasgow. These things were enough to show them the danger of driving these evils underground. He opposed the Bill because it was beginning at the wrong end. Had they done all they ought to do in education, in improving sanitary conditions, in teaching the people the necessity of obeying sanitary laws, and in teaching them self-respect bodily and mentally? Had they trained them in those physical exercises that made them throw off the evils of the alcoholic habit? Had our magistrates and tribunals also punished sufficiently the men and women who brutalised themselves by drink and made themselves a danger to society, or had they punished drunken crimes with the severity that ought to have been directed towards their suppression? Had they not been inclined too much to condone offences against the person committed under the influence of drink? Were they justified in allowing a restriction of the kind proposed on the liberty of their fellow-citizens? He was certain that the great mass of opinion in the country would think it their first duty before doing so to use every method of invocation and punishment and cure upon those guilty of making themselves a danger or a nuisance to their fellow-beings. Because there were a few alcoholic men who were a burden to themselves and to others they were not justified as a nation in imposing a restriction of this sort on the liberties of grown men and women. They were always told by Liberal Members for Scotland that they represented the whole of Scottish opinion. He left them in that profound conviction, but he did not share it with them. They knew how active a small clique of faddists might be. He believed the national feeling, once it thought this question had come within the range of practical politics, would turn against it in a way which would startle hon. Gentlemen opposite.

Mr. R. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:—Ayes, 276; Noes, 106. (Division List No. 145.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romford
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Comm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry

Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, Hamer (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn's-sh)
Hart-Davies, T.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazelton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kettle, Thomas Michael
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederick C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N (Doncast'r)
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Phillipps, Owen, C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E.
Thorne, William
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmart'n)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Robert Balfour and Mr. Leif Jones.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Beckett, Hon. Gervase

Bottomley, Horatio
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gordon, Sir W. Evans-(T'r Ham.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tillet, Louis John
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Viscount Valentia and Lord Edmund Talbot.

Question put accordingly, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

The House divided: — Ayes, 262; Noes, 106. (Division List No 146.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R. L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davies, T.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Afred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molcnto, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarthn
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr Robert Balfour and Mr. Barnes.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex F
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G (Winchester
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George

Cavendish,Rt.Hon.VicterCW.
Cecil,Evelyn(Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P.Joicey-
Cecil,LordR.(Marylebone,E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc
Cochrane,Hon.Thos.H.A.E.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Dixon-Hartland,SirFredDixon
Douglas, Rt.Hon.A.Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,Robert(Lana'k,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber,Capt.W.V.(Hants,W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon .George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner,Ernest(Berks,East)
Gordon,SirW.Evans-(T'rHam.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F(BuryS.Edmd's
Hill,SirClement(Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton,Hon.FrederickWm.
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Long,Col.CharlesW.(Evesham
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M‘Calmont, Colonel James
M‘Hugh, Patrick A.
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson,Wm.G.(Petersfield)
Nield,Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon, N
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F
Rawlinson,JohnFrederickPeel
Remnant,JamesFarquharson
Roberts S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford,John(Lancashire)
Rutherford,W.W.(Liverpool)
Sandys,Lieut-Col.Thos.Myles
Scott,SirS.(Marylebone, W.)
Sheehan, DanielDaniel
Sheehy, David
Smith,Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tillett, Louis John
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.SirC.E.Howard
Walker,Col.W.H.(Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde Col.C.E.(Kent,Mid)
Warner,Thomas CourtenayT.
White,Patrick(Meath,North)
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.
Wortley,Rt.Hon.C.B.Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES.—Mr. F. E. Smith and Viscount Castlereagh.

MR. R. BALFOUR claimed, "That the Main Question be now put."

Main Question put accordingly.

The House divided :—Ayes, 251 ; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 147)

AYES.

Abraham,William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen,A.Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Sir Joseph A.(Finsbury
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Baring,Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brigg, John
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs, Leigh
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham. John Frederick
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats,Sir T.Glen (Renfrew,W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett,C H (Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Adwin A.
Cowan, W. H.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,Major E.Martin(Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birni
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson R. C. Munro
Findlay, Alexander
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh

Hart-Davies, T.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor(Swansea
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kettle, Thomas Michael
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Basselaw)
Nicholson, Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearson, W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinburgh, Central
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E,
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L.(Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Llewellyn(Carm'rth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T.(Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Robert Balfour and Mr. Barnes.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J.(City Lond.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Carlile, E. Hildred
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Honn. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Gordon, Sir W. Evans-(T'r Ham.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Hamilton, Marquess of
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F.(Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)

M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Mason, James F.(Windsor)
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon,N
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S.(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Sandys,Lieut.-Col.Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Sheehy, David
Smith,Abel H.(Hertford East)
Smith,F.E. (Liverpool,Walton)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur (Ormskirk
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton Percy M.
Tillett, Louis John
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent,Col.Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H.(Lancashire
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson,A.Stanley (York,E. R.)
Wortley,Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Noes—Mr. Mitchell-Thomson and Viscount Castlereagh.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the whole House."—(*Sir William Bull.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 75; Noes, 239. (Division List No. 148.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.SirAlex.F.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir FrederickGeorge
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burke, E. Haviland-
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt. Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim, S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Liddell, Henry
Long, Col.Charles W(Evesham
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal,E.)
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G.(Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
Nolan, Joseph
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
Pease,Herbert Pike(Darlington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson,John FrederickPeel
Roberts,S(Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Sandys,Lieut.-Col. Thos.Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford,East)
Smith,F.E.(Liverpool, Walton)
Stanley,Hon. Arthur(Ormskirk
Straus, E. A. (Abingdon)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Tillett, Louis John
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker,Col. W.H.(Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson,A. Stanley(York,E.R.)
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

Tellers for the Ayes—Sir William Bull and Mr. Remnant.

NOES.

Abraham,William (Cork,N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen,A.Acland(Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith,Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker,Joseph A.(Finsbury,E.)
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Beale, W. P.
Bell, Richard
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H D.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Boland, John
Bottomley, Horatio
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Coats,Sir T.Glen(Renfrew,W.)
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.

Dalmeny, Lord
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Freeman-Thomas, Freeman
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Ginnell, L.
Glendinning, R. G.
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth, R.L. (Caithn'ss-sh
Hart-Davis, T.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lamont, Norman
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Luttrell, Hugh Fownes
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
Maddison. Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morsel L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redond, William (Clare)
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T, W.
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E. (Manchester)
Seaverns, J. H.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Weir, James Galloway
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Robert Balfour and Mr. Barnes.

Bill committed to a Standing Committee.

And, it being after half-past Five of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 3.

Adjourned at twenty-two minutes before Six o'clock till Monday next.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 29th April, 1907.

COMMISSION.

The following Bills received the Royal Assent:—

1. Army (Annual).
2. Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Port Seton Deviation) Order Confirmation.
3. Galwey's Divorce.
4. Byrne's Divorce.
5. Royal Insurance Company.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with: South Wales Mineral Railway; Neath, Pontardawe, and Brynaman Railway.

Also the Certificates that the Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with: Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) [H.L.]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

York (Micklegate Strays) Bill [H.L.]. A petition of Messrs. Sherwood and Company, of 7, Great George Street, Westminster, Parliamentary Agents, praying for leave to present a petition of the Freemen of the City of York, praying to be heard by counsel against the Bill, although the time limited by Standing Order No. 92 for presenting such petition has expired; read, and ordered to lie on the Table, and Standing Order No. 92 to be considered To-morrow in order to its being dispensed with in respect of the said petition.

Simon-Carves Bye-Product Coke Oven Construction and Working Company, Limited, Bill [H.L.]. Committed.

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill; Taff Vale Railway Bill. Brought from the Commons, read 1^{a}, and referred to the Examiners.

West Riding Tramways Bill [H.L.]; Medway Lower Navigation Bill [H.L.]. Returned from the Commons agreed to.

Southend-on-Sea Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Select Committee, That it is not expedient to proceed further with the Bill; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [H.L.]. The Lord Bishop of Birmingham (in his place) consented to the Bill.

Baines' Name Bill [H.L.]; Royal Bank of Scotland Bill [H.L.]; King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a}, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill [H.L.]. A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Pwllheli, was presented by the Earl Beauchamp (for the Lord Granard (*E. Granard*)); read 1^{a}; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 40.)

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill (No. 38); Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill (No. 39). Brought from the Commons and read 1^{a}; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 2) Bill [H.L.]. A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Education under the Education Acts, 1870 to 1903, to enable the London County Council to put in force the Lands Clauses Acts, was presented by the Lord President (*E. Crewe*); read 1^{a}; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 37).

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges, etc.) Bill; Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill. Message from the Commons that they have ordered that the Committee appointed by them to join with the Committee of this House, to consider the said Bills, do meet the Lords' Committee in Committee Room A., on Thursday next, at Three o'clock, as proposed by their Lordships.

PETITION.

Companies Bill [H.L.]. Petition for amendment of; of Members of Stock Exchange; read and ordered to lie on the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FEE FUND OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR acquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid on the Table the Annual Account of the Fee Fund of the House of Lords. The same was ordered to lie on the Table, and to be referred to the Select Committee on the House of Lords Offices.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

No. 3769. United States (Porto Rico).

ARMY (VOLUNTEERS).

Annual Return of Volunteer Corps of Great Britain, for the year 1906.

WELLINGTON COLLEGE.

Report of the governors for the year ended 31st December, 1906, with accounts.

ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND.

Annual Report for the year 1906.

VIVISECTION (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Second Report of the Commissioners, and minutes of evidence, February to March, 1907.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

POST OFFICE (FOREIGN AND COLONIAL PARCEL POST: SPAIN AND BALEARIC ISLANDS).

The Foreign and Colonial Parcel Post Amendment (No. 4) Warrant, 1907, dated 11th April, 1907.

INDIA.

Minute by the Secretary of State for India extending the term of Sir James Lyle Mackay's office as member of the Council of India.

BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883 (PROCEEDINGS).

Account showing the receipts and expenditure on account of bankruptcy proceedings during the year ended 31st March, 1907.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (URBAN DISTRICT OF ACTON).

Order made by the council of the urban district of Acton, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within the urban district.

COMPANIES (WINDING-UP) ACT, 1890.

Account showing receipts and expenditure on account of proceedings under the Companies (Winding-Up) Act, 1890, during the year ended 31st March, 1907.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILL.

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill [H.L.]. A Bill to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts, 1894 to 1906, was presented by the Lord Ampthill; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday the 7th of May next. (No. 36.)

PROHIBITION OF MEDICAL PRACTICE BY COMPANIES BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING].

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD HYLTON: My Lords, in asking your Lordships to give a Second Reading to this Bill I hope to be able in a few sentences to convince you of the necessity for legislation of this character. The Medical Acts of 1858 to 1886 provide, in effect, that persons who are legally qualified, by having passed prescribed qualifying examinations, and by being registered in the Medical Register, can lawfully practice medicine, surgery, and midwifery throughout the United Kingdom and His Majesty's dominions elsewhere; and the Acts impose disabilities on persons who carry on medical practice without being duly qualified, and penalties on any unqualified person who falsely assumes the designation of a legally qualified medical practitioner.

But it has, unfortunately, been proved that what it is illegal for a man to do individually he can do by joining unto himself five, six, or seven other unqualified persons. It seems scandalous that such a state of things should be possible, but the General Medical Council, the body whose duty it is, under the Privy Council, to administer these Acts, find that this practice has not only taken root, but is spreading widely. From a document furnished to me by the General Medical Council it appears that the incorporation of these bogus medical and dental companies goes on steadily. A considerable number have been registered since the date of the Council's last memorial to the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council; two, at least, have been quite recently incorporated, and a circular has been actually widely distributed by a firm of company registration agents in which it is urged that unqualified doctors and dentists should avail themselves of incorporation as a means whereby the prohibitions of the Acts may be entirely avoided, these prohibitions being elsewhere described as onerous.

I have had furnished to me by the General Medical Council a long list of these bogus companies. Many of them were included in the Return procured in the House of Commons by Sir John Batty Tuke, but there are others which, for certain technical reasons, were not included in that Return. I will not weary your Lordships by reading out the list of these companies. I might, however, quote one—the British Viavi Company. This company was incorporated in June, 1899, and there was no qualified person among the original signatories. The company had its head office in Regent Street, and many local branches; and the local agents gave applicants who applied to them printed instructions with the various preparations they sold. The treatment by this company has resulted in more than one coroner's inquest. There was an inquest at Eastbourne in the year 1900, where the jury found, in effect, that this company was a fraudulent body. The company brought an action for libel against one of the daily newspapers which reported this verdict, but the jury stopped the case and found at once for the defendants. This company offers one of the most flagrant examples of the way in which fraudulent medical advice is offered to the poorer classes of the community, and the great object of this Bill is to protect the poorer classes, who are more liable to be deceived by these sham doctors and dentists.

Then there is the Macdonald Dental and Medical Company. This company was established in the north of England, and was registered at first as a dental company, but it found its operations so successful that it extended its work, and is now, I believe, established in many of our large towns. There is another company to which the attention of the General Medical Company has been specially called —the World's Dispensary Medical Association. Then there is Izod's Eye and Ear Dispensary in Leeds. The principal partner, a man of the name of Izod, was prosecuted and fined, at the instance of the General Medical Council as a private individual for not being qualified. Immediately he had been fined he formed himself into a company, and has gone on practising ever since, and the General Medical Council find that he cannot be touched. But, even if these companies could be prosecuted and fined, they would at once go into liquidation and no practical result would accrue. There is also Sequah, Limited, and Warner's Safe Cure Company. At an inquest it was stated in evidence that this Safe Cure Company had given pernicious advice to unfortunate patients.

Investigation at Somerset House shows that there are very few shareholders of these companies, and there is no money as a rule behind them. Only sufficient shares are subscribed to enable them to be formed. Your Lordships will naturally wonder why legislation has not already been initiated in order, on the one hand, to protect an honourable profession, and on the other, to prevent poor people's health and lives being sacrificed. The General Medical Council are not to blame. They have endeavoured for several years past to induce successive Governments to take up this matter and to initiate legislation. They were so far successful that in the year 1900 the noble and learned Earl Lord Halsbury, then Lord Chancellor, inserted two clauses into his Companies Bill of that session which would have effectually put a stop to these evils. Those clauses were accepted by your Lordships' House and the Bill containing them went down to the House of Commons. There, unfortunately, the clauses were struck out for the reason that they were not germane to the Bill. Whether or not those clauses were germane to the Companies Bill of that year, the representatives of the medical profession, without exception, in the House of Commons, including Sir Walter Foster and Sir John Batty Tuke, and other Members such as Mr. Bryce, begged the Government of the day not to strike the clauses out. The month, however, was August. Both Houses of the Legislature were anxious, as they usually are at that period of the year, to get the business through, and in order to prevent any opposition the clauses were struck out and the Bill returned in that form to your Lordships, and it was impossible at that late period of the session to re-insert the clauses.

To show the general view of the medical profession at this moment about the absolute necessity of something being done to stop this growing evil I will quote a very few words from *The Hospital* of 13th April. This medical journal says—

> "It is high time for the Legislature to interfere on behalf of honest citizens and for the protection, more especially, of the poorer members of the community. We are glad that a Bill has been introduced into the House of Lords on the subject. In short, the object is to prevent any person doing under the Companies Acts what it is at present illegal for him to do as an individual."

Since Lord Halsbury's Act of 1900 became law the General Medical Council have not been idle in this matter, but, owing to a variety of causes, they have been unable to induce Government to take it up. They approached His Majesty's present Government, and it was suggested that a private Member should bring in a Bill dealing with the matter. I confess that I wish the Bill had been in the hands of some Member more likely to be successful in passing legislation than myself, but I am convinced that if your Lordships will look into this subject you will see that a very serious evil at present exists which it is desirable should be ended as speedily as possible.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*Lord Hylton.*)

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I must say that, like the noble Lord who has just sat down, I greatly lamented the fact that the House of Commons struck out the two clauses referred to from the Companies Bill of 1900. But when that Bill came back to this House it was impossible, owing to the late period of the session, to insist upon the clauses being restored without running the risk of losing the Bill altogether. I can assure your Lordships that at the time these clauses were introduced I received an enormous amount of literature pointing out that the provision made by the Legislature to secure the proper qualification of different classes of medical men had been completely evaded by people turning themselves into companies. In these circumstances I am surprised that so long a time has elapsed without that remedy being applied which I attempted to apply in the clauses which I added to the Companies Bill in 1900. I do not concur that it was quite proper to reject those clauses on the ground that they were not germane to the Bill. I thought at the time, and still think, that they were germane, because they constituted an attempt to prevent the machinery of the company law being used for such a purpose. The objection, however, prevailed, and I regret that so long a period has elapsed before another attempt has been made to remedy the defect.

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE): My Lords, the noble and learned Earl who has just sat down and the noble Lord who introduced this Bill have given the past history of this by no means unimportant matter. I think what happened in the year 1899 was that the noble Earl began by introducing a Bill dealing with this subject only, called the Companies (Medical Profession) Bill, and then it was thought better to attempt to incorporate the substance of that Bill in a general Companies' Bill, but when the Companies Bill went to the House of Commons those clauses met with the fate which has been described. I believe, as a matter of fact, that when the Bill was before the Standing Committee in the House of Commons the clauses were left in by a large majority, principally consisting of those of our way of thinking, and that it was the noble Lord's friends in the other House who got them struck out afterwards. But, however that may be, it is satisfactory, I think, that the noble Lord has brought the question forward again on the present occasion.

This Bill, in our opinion, meets something which really approaches a public scandal—namely, the possibility of evasion by unqualified people of the law relating to medical practice. It is important to point out, however, that this Bill is in one respect exceedingly drastic. Not only does it interfere with the proceedings of unqualified persons, but it also prevents the formation of a company which should employ fully qualified doctors to act for it. That is, no doubt, rather a strong provision, but I think it is quite possible to defend it on the ground that the relations between a doctor and his patient are of so personal and intimate a character that it is not right that he should divide the responsibility; that it ought to rest altogether on him individually, and that he ought not to be able to shelter himself behind the name of a company; and I think it would be generally agreed that the kind of doctor who would allow himself to be employed in that way by a company, probably at a fixed salary, would be one of the derelicts of the profession, and that it would be just as well not to encourage the kind of practice which would exist if such companies were allowed to be formed.

The noble Lord, as I understand, is quite willing, and, indeed, desirous, that this Bill having been read a second time should be referred to a Select Committee. With that course we should fully concur. It is no doubt important to hear what is to be said on the other side, if there is very much to be said on the other side. We desire to avoid all hardship to individuals and any suspicion that we are dealing hardly with the kind of practice that obtains among the very poor. I think it is desirable, therefore, that the matter should be thoroughly thrashed out before a Select Committee, and I hope your Lordships will agree to the Second Reading of the Bill with that purpose.

On Question, Bill read 2ª., and referred to a Select Committee.

DENTAL COMPANIES (RESTRICTION OF PRACTICE) BILL [H.L.].

[Second Reading.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord HYLTON: My Lords, this Bill is entirely on all fours with the preceding one. There was a question, as I understand, whether it was more appropriate to put the two subjects in one Bill or divide them, and the General Medical Council expressed the desire that the subjects should be dealt with in separate Bills. I will not weary your Lordships by repeating the arguments which you have been good enough to consider worthy of recognition in regard to the Bill to which you have just given a Second Reading. Your Lordships will observe that there is a slight difference in the two Bills, and it is on a point upon which the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council remarked just now. This Bill does not propose to make it illegal for a company to practice dentistry provided that all the managers and assistants are duly registered dentists. It has been thought that there should be a distinction in this matter between dentists and duly qualified medical men. I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*Lord Hylton.*)

The Earl of CREWE: My Lords, this Bill, as your Lordships will see, is really complementary to the other, with the slight but not unimportant difference mentioned by the noble Lord. I quite agree that it would be a hardship to prevent these dental companies from being formed, provided they employ registered and duly qualified men. The dentist is in a different position from the doctor in this respect, that he presides in his own torture chamber and very rarely invades the domestic circle. Therefore, the arguments which apply to the doctor do not in the same way apply to him. I hope this Bill will also be read a second time, and I venture to suggest that it should be referred to the same Committee as the previous Bill.

On Question, Bill read 2ª and referred to the Select Committee.

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS AND PESTS BILL [H.L.]

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, the object of this Bill is to grapple with what might be a very serious difficulty in the agricultural world—namely, the introduction of a disease called the gooseberry mildew. The disease has, I believe, appeared to some considerable extent in Worcestershire, and also in Ireland. Much consternation has been aroused in consequence, and there have been no fewer than ten Questions asked in the House of Commons on the subject. At present we have no power whatever to stop the introduction of this disease in any way. The disease, I believe, comes in the gooseberry canes that are introduced into this country in considerable number, and we have no power either to stop the introduction of these canes, to single them out, or to destroy trees in this country that are affected. Therefore this Bill, though a small one, is of considerable importance.

The Bill provides that the Board of Agriculture may make such Orders as they think fit to prevent the introduction or spread of any particular insect, fungus, or other pest, and these Orders may prohibit or regulate the landing of diseased plants and may authorise the removal or destruction of any crop or plant on which the pest is found. Compensation may be given by the local authority of half value in the case of diseased crops and three-fourths value in the case of other crops. Sub-section 2 of Clause 1 is necessary in order to avoid the necessity of having to lay the Order on the Table for forty days before it becomes effective. In this matter instant action is essential, and I may add that a similar provision applies to Orders under the Diseases of Animals Act. There is a great desire among fruit-growers that legislation should be passed to enable this disease to be tackled, and I hope your Lordships will give the Bill a Second Reading.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2^a.—(*Earl Carrington.*)

On Question, Bill read 2^a, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House to-morrow.

SALMON AND FRESHWATER FISHERIES BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the day for the Second Reading read.

EARL CARRINGTON: My Lords, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill I may say that we have been most anxious in the drafting of it to please everybody. We have taken every precaution to consult the leading authorities and persons connected with fisheries, and it may be that we have succeeded in bringing forward a Bill which is very much wanted and which will not receive much opposition. The object of the Bill is to give to local fishery boards powers for raising funds for the improvement and protection of fisheries. Netting in narrow waters will, under the Bill, be somewhat more restricted than is possible under existing arrangements, and provision is made for authorising local fishery boards, under proper restrictions, to set up fisheries along the sea-coasts by methods which, under the present law, would be illegal. It appeared to the Board that to endeavour to legislate on the same lines for all cases and all rivers would be very difficult, and, therefore, it has been thought preferable—and I hope your Lordships will agree that we were right in that—to proceed to regulate each river and group of rivers by means of a separate Provisional Order framed by the Board after all the parties have had an opportunity of stating their views at a local inquiry. The Provisional Order, will, of course, require to be confirmed by Parliament, and the parties will, therefore, have further protection in the right to petition against the Order and to appear before the Committee. The Bill has been considered by the Salmon and Trout Association of Great Britain, and is believed to receive their cordial support. The Bill does not apply to Ireland or Scotland, nor to the Tweed; but it does apply to the Esk River. Since I came to the House I have been asked whether the Bill interferes in any way with private rights. I can confidently assert that private rights under the Bill will in no way be interfered with. All private fisheries will remain as protected and as much the property of their owners as at the present moment. I hope the Bill will meet with the general approval of your Lordships, and I beg to move that it be read a second time.

Moved, That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Earl Carrington.*)

Lord ASHBOURNE: Is there any special reason why the Bill should not extend to Ireland? The water in the Irish rivers is not very dissimilar from that in the English rivers.

Earl CARRINGTON: I am unable to say why the Bill does not apply to Ireland. I can only repeat that it does not so apply.

Lord ASHBOURNE: Perhaps the noble Earl will inform himself in the matter before the next stage.

Earl CARRINGTON: Ireland has a special fishery board of its own.

Lord ASHBOURNE: Of course, there must be special arangements for carrying on the Irish fisheries, but have the authorities in Ireland been asked whether they would like this Bill extended to that country?

The Earl of HAREWOOD: My Lords, with the main provisions of this Bill I have no fault to find, and it is not until we come to Clause 6 that I venture to suggest an alteration. Clause 6 inflicts upon the local fishery board making application under the Bill the whole of the pecuniary burden of the application. These fishery boards are many of them very small bodies with small resources, and the fact that they would have to bear the expense of making application to the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries under the Act would deter many of them from making application; and unless they are relieved at least of some part of that liability, Clauses 2 and 4 of the Bill will be practically inoperative so far as many of the smaller boards are concerned. The Bill was very fully considered at a recent meeting of the Yorkshire Fishery Board, of which I have the honour to be chairman, and this was the only fault found with it. I can assure my noble friend that my only object in calling attention to this matter is to enable the Bill to be rendered more beneficial. It has been said that this is a matter for the Treasury. I can hardly think that that objection will hold good, and I should be glad to receive some assurance from my noble friend that when the Bill gets into Committee he will bring forward some modification, so as not to inflict the whole of the pecuniary burden of these applications on the local bodies.

The Earl of DENBIGH: My Lords, as a member of the committee of the Salmon and Trout Association, which has taken an active part in the preparation of this proposed legislation and in inducing the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries to push it forward with all possible speed, I should like to say that this Bill has met with cordial support from those who have taken an interest in its preparation, and we must earnestly hope that it may be possible to pass it into law this session. There can be no doubt that improved fishery legislation is urgently wanted in this country. We are very much behindhand in this matter. Indeed, we are not nearly so advanced scientifically as America, Germany, and, I believe, Japan. The noble Earl, in moving the Second Reading of the Bill, said he had endeavoured to please everybody. I trust he has succeeded in doing so, because we are aware how conflicting are the interests affected in fishery legislation. I sincerely hope that the Bill may prove to be uncontroversial and that it may pass without opposition.

There is one matter to which I should like to draw my noble friend's attention—the fish-breeding industry. My noble friend has kindly consented to receive a deputation of fish breeders, which I shall have the honour of introducing, and I have only mentioned the matter to-day because I shall very likely put down Amendments in Committee with the view of meeting the grievances which we who take an interest in fish-breeding feel. Fish-breeding has increased very rapidly in this country in recent years, but in this Bill no notice whatever is taken of it. All we ask is that the industry—it is rapidly becoming a commercial industry—shall be recognised, that the legislation shall be suited to it, and that we may not feel that we are absolutely ignored and that legislation which is passed for the rivers is unwittingly allowed to do harm to fish breeders. There are many waters in this country which could be advantageously turned to profit for the purpose of fish breeding, and people are increasingly beginning to realise this fact. It is no longer a rich man's hobby. Many thousands of pounds are being invested in the industry, and all we ask of Parliament is that it should recognise the industry in future legislation.

LORD NEWTON: My Lords, in spite of the assurance which has been given by the noble Earl that this Bill is designed for the purpose of pleasing everybody, I confess I feel some doubt as to whether it is so absolutely innocuous as has been described. If this Bill is such an admirable and desirable measure, why are Scotland and Ireland deprived of its benefits? I observed what I thought to be a slight inconsistency in the statement of the noble Earl. He said there was no intention whatever of interfering with the rights of private proprietors. I should like to point out that the mere fact of creating a water board is a very serious interference with the rights of private proprietors. It seems to me that under Clause 3 of the Bill it will be in the power of a person possessing a very insignificant portion of water to cause a considerable amount of expense and trouble, and the result may be that proprietors who have spent a great deal of money and devoted much attention to the improvement of their fisheries may find their fisheries taken from their control and handed over to the Board. In these circumstances, and as the Bill is of a somewhat more complicated nature than might be supposed from the statement of the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries, I trust that ample time will be given for the considera- of the Bill before the Committee stage.

LORD BARNARD: My Lords, the noble Earl the President of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries stated that he had consulted everybody interested before bringing forward this Bill, but I should like to point out that the fishery board of which I have the honour to be chairman knew nothing of this proposed legislation until I brought it to their notice a few days ago. The noble Earl knows better than I do how many of these boards there are in England, and I should like to ask him whether my board was singular in not having been consulted. The fact that these bodies exist throughout the length and breadth of the country makes me wonder why it was necessary to upset the existing boards and put new boards in their place. I confess that I have not been able to ascertain the reason for this.

The noble Earl informed us that he proposes to give additional powers and facilities to the new boards. I should have thought that these new powers and facilities could have been equally well conferred upon the existing boards, and thus have avoided the expense to which my noble friend Lord Harewood alluded. The principal feature of the Bill, in my opinion, is that it proposes to reintroduce stake nets—what are known to the law as "fixed engines." The only member of my board who has ventured to express an opinion in regard to the Bill, and who has been a member of the board since its inception thirty or forty years ago, stated that, in his opinion, this was a most retrograde step. I think before such a proposal is agreed to this House and the country at large are entitled to have some further information as to why a method of fishing which has been abolished for a great many years is to be re-introduced. I hope the noble Earl will not hurry on the Committee stage, but will give the various fishery boards an opportunity of considering the Bill.

EARL CARRINGTON: In regard to the question brought forward by the Earl of Harewood, I do not think the expenses will be so very heavy as the noble Lord considers. If the inquiry is held by local people it is supposed generally that the expenses would certainly be under £20, though of course if the inquiry were extended it would run into a great deal more money. I believe Provisional Orders in all cases are paid for by the persons who are interested in them, and therefore I cannot hold out any great hopes that we shall be able to meet the wishes of the noble Earl. The question of fish culture, to which Lord Denbigh referred, will be most carefully considered, and we shall be pleased to take any proposals of his on that subject, on which he is so great an expert, into careful consideration. There is no wish to hurry the progress of the Bill, and, if the noble Earl desires it, we might leave the next stage till after Whitsuntide. In reply to Lord Barnard, I regret that the board with which the noble Lord is concerned did not have timely notice of the Bill, but I think the question of stake nets is one of the details which might be relegated to the Committee stage.

EARL CAWDOR: There was one point raised by my noble friend behind me which the noble Earl has not dealt with. Lord Barnard pointed out that, under the Bill, certain existing boards of conservators may be abolished, and he asked the noble Earl why the provisions of this Bill could not be carried out by the present boards. That seems to me to go to the very root of the Bill, and requires an explanation before we take the Second Reading.

EARL CARRINGTON: It seems to most persons intimately connected with the fisheries that what is proposed in the Bill is a reasonable and proper way to get out of the difficulty that at present exists. If any better proposal can be brought forward from the other side of the House we shall be only too pleased to consider it.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN: The noble Earl has given no reason for the abolition of the existing boards. That question is a very important one, and it really goes to the principle of the Bill. If the noble Earl is not in a position to give us an answer to that question to-day I would suggest that the debate should be adjourned, and that on some future occasion he should inform us why he desires to take these powers. Existing boards of conservators, I imagine, view with some apprehension this power to abolish them, and they would like to know why such power is sought. If my Motion is agreed to I would suggest that in the meantime the Bill should be circulated to all the boards concerned.

Moved, That the debate be adjourned—(*The Earl of Camperdown*).

EARL CARRINGTON: I am quite prepared to accept that Motion.

***LORD HAVERSHAM**: The whole of this question is settled by Clause 3. Under that clause the machinery of the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries cannot be put in motion except on the application of the conservators themselves, or of the county council, or of the persons who are the owners of one-tenth at least in value of the private fisheries proposed to be regulated. Therefore, the machinery could not be put in motion unless the initiative came from those concerned. The Board of Agriculture and Fisheries has no power of initiating proceedings.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: I would suggest that, as this Bill bristles with technical and difficult points, it might be desirable to circulate a Memorandum dealing with some of them for the information of the House. That course is frequently adopted, and it seems to me that in this case it might have good results.

THE EARL OF DENBIGH: I do not know whether, having been in touch with those who prepared this Bill, I should be in order if I explained that the reason for transferring the powers of conservators under this Bill is that in many cases the boards of conservators have no riparian interests. It is solely with the view of improving the boards and securing the appointment of people better calculated to look after the interests of the fisheries, that this proposal has been brought forward.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN): I would point out that the change cannot be made except by Provisional Order, and, under the Bill, no Provisional Order can have any operation until it has been confirmed by Parliament. Therefore, no existing board could be abolished except with the consent of Parliament.

LORD BARNARD: Will the noble Earl circulate the Bill to the various boards concerned?

EARL CARRINGTON: Yes.

On Question, debate adjourned.

DISSEMINATION OF NEWS IN WAR TIME.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I rise to call the attention of the House to the conclusion of a speech made in it by the First Lord of the Admiralty, on the 13th July, 1906, in which he said that—

> "His Majesty's Government were anxious to deal with the question of publication of news in war time in a way that would be both good for the country and satisfactory to the Press, and I may add that, only a fortnight ago, the Prime Minister, in another place, said the subject would be dealt with early next session";

and to ask the Government what steps they are taking to carry out this undertaking.

As I have already brought this question before your Lordships on four different occasions, and as no one attempted to dispute the facts or to refute the arguments that I then brought forward, I shall not take up the time of the House by much repetition of the same or similar facts and arguments. I have already quoted the opinions of Nelson, Wellington, and Napoleon, and I have touched on the experiences of the Japanese war. If it was necessary to do so, I think that I could find incidents proving the necessity of secrecy during hostilities in every war of which we have any historical record.

Since I first raised this subject, I know of only one man who, either by his voice or by his signature, has attempted to prove that unrestricted freedom of publication of news should be permitted during war. Naval officers differ on many points, but on this point they all hold the same opinion and consider legislation necessary. Of course one can scarcely expect the same degree of unanimity among journalists. But the better portion of the Press are in favour of an alteration in the law. In June last year the Newspaper Society appointed a sub-committee to draw up a draft Bill on the subject. All measures of importance are opposed by some of our newspapers, and if we were always to wait before bringing Bills into Parliament until the Press had come to an agreement about them, we should be worse off than the Medes and Persians.

The defence of this country is not a mere question of paying taxes. We must put our house in order as well, and pass laws which will enable those taxes to be spent to some purpose. If, while our laws remain unaltered, we were attacked or went to war in self-defence, we should greatly increase our chances of defeat, and should thoroughly deserve our punishment. In neither House is the Opposition likely to object to a reasonable measure which would lie dormant until war clouds gathered round us. I hope that the Government will take courage, grasp the nettle, and keep their pledge of last year. If they do so, they are certain of the support of the best portion of the Press, and of the commonsense of the nation.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord TWEEDMOUTH): My Lords, I entirely sympathise with the view which the noble Lord takes. It is quite impossible for any man who holds the office that I do not to feel supremely alive to the danger of the dissemination of news, either just before the outbreak of a war or during a war, which would be an injury to our forces engaged in that war.

But, my Lords, I cannot quite go the length that Lord Ellenborough wants. I do not think it is possible to hold out a hope of being able to deal with this question absolutely immediately. In the first place there is a great number of Bills blocking the path; it would be very difficult to add to that number now, and it would be very difficult to pass the Bill that would be required without a considerable amount of discussion. I think I can show, even by the recent history of what has been done in regard to this question, that it is desirable that some further consideration should be given before a Bill is absolutely presented to Parliament. The British Press is, I think it will be agreed, greatly to be praised and greatly to be trusted for the way in which it does check the publication of news that is likely to do harm and cause danger to this country.

I do not think the noble Lord gave a quite correct account of what was done last year. It is true that a committee of the Newspaper Society was appointed last year, consisting of three distinguished gentlemen connected with the Press, together with the solicitor of the society. They met and drew up eight resolutions on which, they said, a Bill might be framed. The report of this committee was referred to a general meeting of the Newspaper Society, and at that meeting Mr. Walter moved this resolution—

> "That this meeting cordially approves the action which has been taken by the Newspaper Society in appointing a sub-committee to confer with the Committee of Imperial Defence, fully endorses the principles accepted by the sub-committee to govern any legislation dealing with the dissemination of news in time of war and when war is imminent, and authorising such sub-committee of the Newspaper Society to continue to act and to consider any Bill that may be drafted on the subject."

But to that resolution an amendment was moved and carried as follows—

> "That this meeting cordially approves the action which has been taken by the Newspaper Society in appointing a sub-committee to confer with the Committee of Imperial Defence in regard to the principles that should govern any legislation dealing with the dissemination of news in time of war and when war is imminent, and authorises such committee of the Newspaper Society to add to its members and to continue to act and to consider any Bill that may be drafted on the subject."

A further resolution was passed in these terms—

> "That the conclusions of the sub-committee be submitted to a future conference before the Bill is introduced into Parliament."

I think it is very desirable that we should, as far as possible, carry the chosen representatives of the Press, most of whom, I think, are prepared to support such a proposal, with us, and the suggestion I make is that I should have a Bill drafted and referred to the law officers for their opinion. Then it would be referred to the sub-committee of the Newspaper Society, and, after that, it would be considered by the Newspaper Society itself. I believe this would be an effectual measure, and that it would do much to enable us to work with the representatives of the Press—a co-operation which I look upon as most important. We have no reason to think that we shall not have the help of the Press, and it is very desirable that we should have them with us. I hope my suggestion will receive the commendation of your Lordships.

EARL CAWDOR: My Lords, I am afraid we have not advanced quite so far in this matter as the noble Lord held out hopes of last session.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: It was not my promise.

EARL CAWDOR: No, but the noble Earl quoted the Prime Minister's expression of his hope that a Bill dealing with this subject might be introduced early this session. I quite appreciate the very great difficulty of carrying that through, and I do not desire to press the matter unduly. If the noble Earl is of opinion that the course he has now suggested is the best course, I certainly shall raise no objection. I am only glad that we are taking some step towards the end we all desire to attain.

THE TERRITORIAL ARMY.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: My Lords, I venture respectfully to put to the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War the Questions standing in my name on the Notice Paper, namely—

1. What is the earliest age at which a recruit will be accepted for the Territorial Army;

2. Will any youth under twenty be reckoned as effective;

3. If so, what proportion of the 300,000 men composing the Territorial Army will be below twenty years of age;

4. What in the way of drill is the least that can be yearly required of a soldier in the Territorial Army;

5. Will this amount of drill render him reliable and fit to meet picked Continental troops;

6. If not, what further amount of drill will he be compelled to undergo, and when;

7. When will the hoped for Territorial Army be in a position to be mobilised;

8. Within how many hours or days after the order to mobilise has been

received will it locally be ready to take the field equipped in all respects for war, including sufficient guns up-to-date.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (The Earl of Portsmouth): My Lords, in reply to the catechism of the noble Earl, I propose to take Questions 1 and 2 together, and my Answer is that this is a matter which will have to be discussed in the county associations when they are formed. The military authorities would like soldiers to be not less than nineteen years of age even for home defence. At present the age is seventeen. The noble Lord has, in his Question, taken the high standard of twenty years. It is true that that has been the standard in the past for service abroad, but I may inform the noble Lord that the Army Council are now, with their medical advisers, considering whether the standard in the Regular Army for service abroad could not be made nineteen instead of twenty. Question 3 is obviously one I cannot answer, because it must depend on the results of Questions 1 and 2, and, as I have said, Questions 1 and 2 are not yet settled. As regards Question 4, I must refer my noble friend to Clauses 14 and 16 of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill. But I must add that the present provision of those clauses is liable, and intentionally, in the drafting, made liable to modification in Committee; and, furthermore, that the details of the Order in Council provided for in Clause 14 have not yet been fully determined upon. Those are matters which will be considered fully when the Bill is in Committee in another place. My Answer to Question 5 is that it is not contemplated, and never has been contemplated, that troops with this amount of training would be either fit or expected to meet, unaided, as my noble friend presumes, picked Continental troops.

*The Earl of WEMYSS: May I ask what amount of training they will have to fit them to meet such troops?

The Earl of PORTSMOUTH: That is a very argumentative Question; but if my noble friend will put it in the form of a Motion I will give him what information I can. As regards Question 6, further drill and training for at least six months will be undergone after embodiment after mobilisation is ordered. My Answer to Question 7 is when the county associations have been formed and a sufficient number of existing units of the Auxiliary Forces have been transferred.

*The Earl of WEMYSS: When as to time is that likely to be?

The Earl of PORTSMOUTH: That depends on the progress of the Bill in Parliament. As regards Question 8, I am afraid that is a question I cannot deal with. It cannot be definitely stated, as details have not yet been fully elaborated, but I would remind my noble friend that, even if these facts and figures were available, questions of mobilisation have always been regarded as strictly confidential. I venture to say it would be extremely doubtful whether any public advantage could ever be gained by making questions of that kind public.

*The Earl of WEMYSS: I shall, on a proper occasion, call attention to the Answers of the noble Earl to my Questions. I would like to hear from the noble Earl the reason why at one time the Secretary of State for War said he would require 700,000 or 900,000 Volunteers to form his Territorial Army, and now, when the Bill is introduced, he is satisfied with a force of 300,000 men composed of Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers.

The Earl of PORTSMOUTH: I am quite unable, off-hand, to make any Answer to that Question.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: My Lords, we are obliged to the noble Earl the Under-Secretary of State for War for the reply he has given to my noble friend, but I am sure he will permit me to make just one observation. On a previous occasion I ventured to ask the noble Earl, as representing the War Office in this House, whether the Government would not consent to give us a little more information in the form of a Memorandum as to how they proposed that the new scheme should work, and I was met by the noble Earl in the most friendly spirit. He was kind enough matter of fact, shortly after that a to say across the floor of the House that he would do what he could, and, as a

Memorandum was issued, and the noble Earl kindly sent me an advance copy. I am encouraged by my success, if it was my success, on a previous occasion to make another suggestion on the same lines.

In reply to Question 4 the noble Earl said that the amount of drill which would be accorded to the Territorial Force would be determined by an Order in Council. It would not be regular for us to discuss in any detail the provisions of a Bill before the other House of Parliament, but one may say, generally, that a great deal in that Bill is reserved for provision by regulations or by Order in Council; so much so, indeed, that it is almost impossible to realise what the detailed effect of the measure will be unless we are privileged to see the kind of Orders in Council which the noble Earl and the Army Council would advise His Majesty to issue. Now will they not, at any rate before your Lordships are called upon to discuss the Bill, prepare the kind of regulations and the kind of Orders in Council they propose afterwards to issue, in order that we may be informed of the sort of force they contemplate. I do not for a moment suggest that they should bind themselves absolutely, but so much is left to be afterwards filled in that without some such device as I have suggested Parliament never will be in possession of the proposals of the Government.

The matter of drill is, of course, vital, for it is no use having an Army unless it has some modicum of drill; and, as far as we can see, the drill of the Territorial Force is so small as to be utterly insufficient. What we want to know, therefore, is precisely how the country will stand after the proposals of the Government have been agreed to—what kind of force the country will really have to rely upon; and I do not think it is too much that we should press the Government to take the country into their confidence in the matter. Neither in this House nor in another place have the proposals of the Government been met in anything like a party spirit, and we are entitled, *per contra*, to a little confidence from the Government, and to be told what is intended. I do not ask for a reply at this moment, but I hope the noble Earl will represent to the Army Council that some such information ought to be placed before Parliament in order that we may see how the scheme will work.

The noble Earl said that a large part of the training which the Government consider necessary for the Territorial Force would be given after the declaration of war and when the force is mobilised. Everybody sees how perilous a proposal that is. How can we be sure that the enemy will wait six months in order that the Territorial Force should be properly trained before they make an attack on our shores? Of course, if the noble Earl and his colleagues have private information which assures them that no enemy would dream of attacking us for six months, that would reassure the country; but without that none of us can feel any confidence that this six months training after declaration of war meets the requirements of the country. That illustrates how necessary it is for the Government to take us into their confidence.

THE EARL OF PORTSMOUTH: I quite appreciate the friendly spirit in which the noble Marquess has urged his point, and I wish to assure him that the Secretary for War and myself realise that the question of the Army is not treated as a party matter; and, in dealing with it, we intend to proceed on the same lines. I cannot, of course, pledge myself in any way, but I shall be glad to convey the views of the noble Marquess to the Army Council. I can assure him that I appreciate most fully, as I am sure the whole of the members of the Army Council do, the grave question which he has raised as to the importance, if possible, of meeting the matter of drill before actual declaration of war.

*THE EARL OF WEMYSS: I wish to give notice that I shall take an early opportunity of calling attention to the Under-Secretary for War's speech, and will endeavour to give the Answers to my Questions which my noble friend has declined to give.

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) Such forms have been issued in the course of the regular annual procedure. It is impossible for the Inland Revenue either to anticipate the decisions of Parliament or to arrest the whole machinery of assessment until those decisions have been finally reached. When that has been done, the necessary measures for correction and adjustment will be taken.

Irish Police and Cloveneden Hibernians' Bands.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he is aware that on the 28th January, 1907, the authorities of Dublin Castle, in response to a petition from the Catholic inhabitants of the townland of Cloveneden, in the parish of Loughall, in the county of Armagh, stated that they had issued instructions to the local police that the Cloveneden band of the Ancient Order of Hibernians should be permitted to proceed from the Hibernian Hall *via* a bye-road, passing the Catholic curate's house, to the county road leading to the Catholic chapel; that on the 18th March, 1907, a force of forty police, under the command of Inspector Hussey, contravened these instructions, refusing to allow the band to take this route, compelling them to go by a swampy track by the Moy Road to Armagh, three miles out of their way; that on that date the Orangemen were permitted to parade all day up and down on the road leading to the Catholic chapel with sticks and firearms, the police looking on; and that on the 25th of the same month (a holiday) the police again refused to allow the band to go in procession from their hall to the Catholic chapel stating that they would use physical force to prevent the band so doing, though the Hibernians had fulfilled the request of Dublin Castle that due notice of the procession should be given to the police authorities; and whether he will take steps to secure that in future Catholics will be permitted the use of the King's high road, in conformity with the Law of the land and the instructions of Dublin Castle.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The instructions to the police are as stated in the Question, but they apply solely to occasions on which the band is about to proceed to or towards the Catholic chapel. The band has been distinctly informed that it cannot be allowed to go in the opposite direction, namely, over Cloveneden Hill, which would be both an unnecessary and provocative proceeding. The members of the band gave notice to the police that they intended to go to Armagh on 18th March. The police refused to permit them to proceed by the route over Cloveneden Hill, and required them to go by an alternative route which is somewhat shorter. The route which the band was obliged to follow is in bad repair, but the other route is in a similar state. There is no foundation for the statement that the Orangemen were permitted to parade all day on the road leading to the Catholic chapel. It is not the fact that on 25th March the police refused to allow the band to proceed to the chapel; on the contrary, arrangements had been made to send a large force of police to protect the procession, but the procession was abandoned. The band can proceed by a direct route to any destination without passing over Cloveneden Hill, and in doing so will receive full protection from the police. For the reasons already stated, it cannot be permitted to pass over Cloveneden Hill.

Iron and Steel Imports into Canada—Duty on British and Foreign Goods.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): To ask the President to the Board of Trade what iron and steel manufactures are imported free of duty under the new Canadian tariff if imported from the United Kingdom or a British Possession and are dutiable if imported from a foreign country.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) In order to benefit by the preference accorded to British goods under the new Canadian tariff it is requisite that the goods shall be the produce of, and not merely imported from, the United Kingdom or a British Possession. The following is a list of the iron and steel manufactures enumerated in the tariff which are free of duty on importation if the produce of the United Kingdom or a British Possession, but which are dutiable if the produce of a foreign country:—Rolled iron or steel and cast steel, in bars, bands, hoop, scroll, strip, sheet, or plate, of any size, thickness, or width, galvanised, or coated with any material or not, and steel blanks for the manufacture of milling cutters, when of greater value than 3½ cents. per pound. Rolled iron or steel sheets and strips, polished or not, number 14 gauge and thinner, not otherwise provided for, Canada plates, Russian iron, terne plates and rolled sheets of iron or steel coated with zinc, spelter, or other metal, of all widths or thicknesses not otherwise provided for, and rolled iron or steel hoop, band, scroll, or strip, number 14 gauge and thinner, galvanised, or coated with other metal or not, not otherwise provided for. Seamless steel tubing, valued at not less than 3½ cents. per pound, rolled or drawn square tubing of iron or steel, adapted for use in the manufacture of agricultural implements; steel balls, adapted for use on bearings of machinery and vehicles. Wire, crucible cast steel, valued at not less than 6 cents. per pound.

Wages in Spinning Factories in Lancashire and Belfast.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Secretary to the Board of Trade whether he can state the comparative wages paid in Lancashire and in Belfast to male operatives and to female operatives in spinning factories; and whether he can give any statistics as to the wages paid in Belfast in other industries compared with wages paid in the same industries in cities in England.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) Spinners in the cotton trade in Lancashire are mostly men, while in the linen trade in Belfast they are mostly women. The latest available official statistics giving information as to the earnings in these two trades, in which the system of piecework prevails, is contained in the Report on Wages in the Textile Trades (Cd. 5807 of 1889). A general inquiry by the Board of Trade into earnings is now in progress which will give information on this subject. As regards trades in which piece wages are not the prevalent system of payment, reference may be made to the recently issued Report on Standard Time Rates of Wages at October, 1906 [Cd. 3245].

Use of Clogher Courthouse for Foresters' Concert.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the High Sheriff of Tyrone has refused the use of the courthouse at Clogher for a concert in connection with the National Foresters' Society on the ground that the purpose is political; whether the courthouse is maintained out of the public rates; and, seeing that it is the only public building in the town, if there is any way of securing its use in the future, as in the past, for all sections of the people.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I have referred this Question to the High Sheriff of county Tyrone, who informs me that he has received an application from a national band for the use of Clogher Courthouse for a concert, and has refused it on the ground that the concert was to be held for the promotion of party politics. The courthouse is maintained out of the rates. The custody and control of county courthouses is entirely vested in the high sheriff of the county, and under the Law as it stands the Government have no power to interfere with the high sheriff's discretion as to the purposes for which he may permit a courthouse to be used when not required for the administration of the Law.

Convictions of Soldiers on Foreign Service.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the Annual Report on the Army [Cd. 3365], page 81, what were the rank and corps of the seven men serving abroad who were sentenced to penal servitude during the year ending 30th September, 1906; will he give in each case the offence or offences for which each man was tried, the sentences inflicted, and when, where, and by whom they were tried, and also the names of the persons who confirmed the sentences; whether the evidence has since been submitted to the Judge Advocate General; and if he sanctioned each sentence.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane*). The following are the particulars asked for:—

Rank.	Corps.	Offence.	Sentence.	Tried.			Sentence confirmed by
				On	At	By	
Private .	3rd Bn. Middlesex Regiment	Disobedience and violence to a corporal	3 years	27/10/05	Middelburg, Transvaal	General court-martial	G.O.C. in C., South Africa
Lance-corporal	2nd Bn. Shropshire Light Infantry	Drunkenness and wounding with intent to murder	5 years	10/4/05	Fyzabad	,,	Lieut.-General Gaselee
Gunner .	Royal Field Artillery	Wounding with intent to murder	5 years	26/4/05	Rawal Pindi	,,	Lieut.-General Blood
Private .	3rd Bn. Middlesex Regiment	Striking sergeant-major	3 years and ignominy	7/6/06	Roberts' Heights, Transvaal	,,	G.O.C. in C., South Africa
Private .	1st Bn. King's Own Yorkshire Light Infantry	Sodomy	10 years and ignominy	7/8/06	Gibraltar	,,	G.O.C. in C., Gibraltar
Private .	3rd Bn. Middlesex Regiment	Striking captain	3 years and ignominy	22/8/06	Middelburg	,,	G.O.C. in C., South Africa
Gunner .	Royal Field Artillery	Striking sergeant and violence to lieutenant-colonel	3 years and ignominy	31/8/06	Trimulgherry	,,	Lieut.-General Egerton

Except in the Indian cases the proceedings were passed by the Judge Advocate General.

The Auxiliary Forces and the New Army Scheme.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he intends to do away with any Volunteer battalions under the new scheme, or change the nature of any of the units of the Auxiliary Forces; and, if so, whether this duty will be relegated to the county association.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Under the scheme it is proposed that the Army Council shall notify its requirements for each locality to the county associations. The associations will then, in conjunction with the Army Council, work out the most suitable arrangements to meet those requirements, which will involve in many cases the changing of the nature of existing units in the Auxiliary Forces.

Ecclesiastical Disorders.

Mr. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that disorders continue in the Church of England, and that the archbishops and bishops have failed to take such steps as are necessary to enforce compliance with the law; and whether he will advise the withdrawal of the Letters of Business, recently issued to the Houses of Convocation, until such compliance has been enforced by the archbishops and bishops.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) It is common knowledge that such disorders exist, and that the episcopal authorities have not enforced complete compliance with the law. I am unable to adopt my hon. friend's suggestion. Even if it were practicable I doubt if it would be effective.

Royal Commission on Motor Cars—Government Action.

Colonel WARDE (Kent, Medway): To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can yet announce when action will be taken as the result of the Royal Commission on Motor Cars, which reported in July, 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) I cannot at present make any announcement with regard to this matter.

St. Lucia Riots—Nearest Warship.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what was the distance between the nearest available warship and the scene of the riots in St. Lucia on Tuesday, 23rd April; and how many of His Majesty's warships were within two days steam of the island on that date.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) 1,130 miles is the reply to the first part of the Question, and none to the second part. I may add that H.M.S. "Indefatigable" left Jamaica for Santa Lucia at noon on Sunday, 28th, a voyage of 930 miles.

Erosion of Bottom Plates of H.M.S. "Antrim."

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that in the bottom plates of H.M.S. "Antrim," completed two years ago, serious erosion has set up; and, if the facts are as stated, whether any explanation can be offered, and whether any investigation has been held.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Reports have been received of somewhat extensive pitting and oxidation in the bottom of the "Antrim." Steps were immediately taken to deal with the matter, and according to the latest report the pitting has been arrested on one half of the ship, and the other half will be similarly treated. An investigation has been held, and a Report received to the effect that the cause of the pitting cannot yet be definitely stated, but the question is still under consideration.

Re-decoration of British Museum Reading Room.

Mr. HADDOCK (Lancashire, North Lonsdale): To ask the First Commissioner of Works why the firm now redecorating the reading room of the British Museum has been required to specify that the gold-leaf to be employed shall be of British manufacture.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) Because it was supposed to be of more lasting quality.

Plague Precautions in India.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): To ask the Secretary of State for India, what action has been taken by the Government in regard to a deputation of the Royal College of Physicians, in May, 1905, to the Secretary of State for India, pointing out the danger of the plague and recommending certain measures to be taken; and will he lay upon the Table the Memorandum of the College of Physicians.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) Some delay, which I regret, has occurred in this matter. The Memorandum reached India at a time when the Government of India had called for and were awaiting Reports by the local governments on the subject of plague remedies, based on the personal experience of their officers. These Reports, which are very voluminous, were dealt with in a published resolution by the Government of India of the 17th January, 1906, laying down in detail a complete policy for dealing with plague. This policy in its preventive features is in practical accordance with the Memorandum of the Royal College of Physicians. The Government of India have since considered, in communication with the local governments, the recommendations of the Memorandum for a special medical organisation for dealing with plague. Their scheme has not yet been definitely formulated, but I understand that the sanitary service will be strengthened by employing a large number of qualified Natives of India. I shall be happy to lay the Memorandum upon the Table if my hon. friend will move for it.

Completion of the Calcutta Memorial.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the sum of £300,000 was subscribed more than five years ago for the construction of the monument to Her late Majesty to be known as the Calcutta Memorial; whether such monument is under construction; and on what date it is expected to be completed.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the affirmative. The monument is under construction. It is not known when it is likely to be completed.

Irish Labourers' Cottages.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is within the power of a rural district council and the Local Government Board to sanction the erection of a cottage under the Labourers Acts where the applicant's present cottage is sanitary, but owing to its small size and the number of the applicant's family, the ordinary decencies of life cannot be observed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Answer to this Question would depend upon the circumstances of the particular case. Under Section 4 of The Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883, a labourer's cottage may be provided when the applicant's existing house is unfit for habitation owing to the want of light, air, ventilation, or proper conveniences.

Parliamentary Electors Struck off Roll for Non-payment of Poor Rates.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will consent to a Return being furnished by the collectors of the poor rate in Ireland setting forth, according to constituency or Parliamentary division, the number of persons struck off the voters' lists at the revisions of 1905 and 1906 by reason of the non-payment, within the statutable time, of the poor rate payable out of their qualifying premises; and also the number of such persons who in both years subsequently paid to the collectors the full amount of the rates due.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have made inquiries as to the possibility of obtaining this Return, and they have come to the conclusion that it would be impossible to procure it with anything like accuracy, for in many cases poor rate collectors' districts extend into more than one Parliamentary division. Moreover, the collectors have not been required to keep records of the persons objected to, and the labour involved in making the necessary searches through the rate books, both as regards objections and subsequent payments, would be so great that it might seriously interfere with the collection of the current rate. The Government will, however, consider whether it may be possible to arrange that rate collectors should keep records of the number of persons struck off the voters' lists at this year's revision by reason of non-payment of poor rate.

Appointments to Messengerships in the Irish Office.

Sir SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland how many appointments have been made to permanent messengerships at the Irish Office since January, 1906; and what was the occupation of the individual men prior to appointment.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) No such appointment has been made since January, 1906, at the Irish Office in London. One appointment has been made at the Chief Secretary's Office, Dublin Castle. The previous occupation of the man appointed was that of a constable in the Royal Irish Constabulary.

Carrick-on-Shannon Disturbances.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can give the House any information respecting the riotous proceedings at Carrick-on-Shannon on Thursday last, and state whether any persons have been arrested in connection with the disturbances.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) On the occasion in question, which was market day in Carrick-on-Shannon, several contingents with bands attempted to enter the town, with the object, as the police believed, of intimidating persons who had taken grazing lands. The police warned the persons concerned that they would not be allowed to enter the town, and, upon their persisting, prevented them from doing so. Some disturbances took place, but the police succeeded in achieving their object. No arrests were made, but the evidence available against certain persons is under consideration, with the object of deciding its sufficiency to ground a prosecution.

Enlistment in the Militia prior to passing of Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill.

Lord J. JOICEY-CECIL (Lincolnshire, Stamford): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether a man enlisting in the Militia, before the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill passes into Law, will be entitled to receive the same pay, allowances, bounty, and articles of clothing as at present for the whole time, six years, of his enlistment; or, if not, for what portion thereof.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) A man enlisting in the Militia before the Bill becomes Law will come under Clause 28, and if he does not consent to serve under the new conditions he will, if called up for training as a Militiaman, receive the pay and allowances for which he contracted.

Employment for Workmen discharged from Woolwich Arsenal.

Mr. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has reason to believe that the state of the labour market is such that the workmen discharged or about to be discharged from Woolwich Arsenal will generally be able to obtain employment in this country; and, if not, whether he will be disposed to consider the practicability, in the case of skilled workmen of long service, of affording in the case of those who desire it pecuniary facilities for emigration to those of our Colonies where a demand for a similar class of labour obtains, or, if this be impracticable, to make some grant by way of bonus in order that they may be supported for a reasonable time while seeking employment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) There is reason to believe that skilled workmen, and especially mechanics, will be able to obtain employment in this country without difficulty. Workmen who have more than seven years service in the Ordnance Factories are, when discharged on reduction, entitled to a bonus of one week's wage for each year of service. There are no funds at my disposal from which pecuniary aid of the nature suggested in the Question could be granted.

Finance Act, Section 20, and the Transvaal.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies why the provisions of Section 20 of the Finance Act of 1894 have not been made applicable to the Transvaal.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) Section 20 of the Finance Act, 1894, cannot be applied to the Transvaal unless and until the law governing the levying of estate duty in that Colony has been modified. This has not been found practicable hitherto. I cannot at present say what view of the matter will be taken by the new Government.

The White Slave Traffic.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to lay upon the Table any Papers relating to the third International Congress for the suppression of the white slave traffic, held at Paris in October last.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) The Answer to the Question is in the affirmative. Papers will be laid in the course of the next few days.

Land under Crops in Great Britain, Belgium, France, Germany, and Ireland.

MR. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the statistics in his possession of the percentage of land under crops in Great Britain, Belgium, France, Germany, and Ireland, distinguish between hay land, pasture land, and land yielding grain, root, and green crops.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Answer is in the affirmative, except that in the case of France the statistics do not distinguish between hay and pasture land. Treating the expression "hay land" as applying only to permanent grass, excluding clover and rotation grasses cut for hay, the percentages to the total area under crops (including pasture and rough grazings) are approximately—

	Hay Land.	Pasture Land.	Grain, root, and green crops.
Great Britain - -	10	56	34
Belgium - - -	13	13	74
France - - - .	—	—	82
Germany - - -	17	8	75
Ireland - - - -	11	65	24

It must be remembered that the figures for each country relate to different years, except in the case of Great Britain and Ireland.

Removal of Plant Houses and Forcing Frames from Kensington Gardens.

SIR GEORGE FARDELL (Paddington, S.): To ask the First Commissioner of Works if he can state when the plant houses and forcing frames for the plants required for the service of the Royal parks, which stand in Kensington Gardens and spoil the architectural effect of the Palace and of Wren's orangery, will be removed to the enclosure in Hyde Park, the area occupied at present by the houses and frames, when vacated, being laid out as an ornamental garden, an improvement foreshadowed in the Answer given by his predecessor in office on 22nd February, 1904.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) As I stated in the discussion on my Estimates, I hope to be able to carry out this work at the end of this year and to undertake the ornamental garden next year if funds are provided.

Guardians as Magistrates Adjudicating in Poor Law Cases.

MR. BRUNNER (Lancashire, Leigh): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the practice of certain magistrates of adjudicating in cases where, as guardians of the poor, they are prosecutors; and whether he will cause a circular to be issued intimating the undesirability of the practice.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I have no information to show that any circular on this subject is called for. I may point out that there is nothing to prevent magistrates who are guardians adjudicating in such cases, provided that they were not present at the meeting of guardians at which the resolution to prosecute was passed.

Hours of Labour in Mines.

MR. GLOVER (St. Helens): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it is the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to shorten the hours of labour in mines, and to pass it into law this session of Parliament; and when the Government will introduce the Bill.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) As I have already stated, the Government intend to bring in a Bill to shorten the hours of labour in mines as soon as possible after the Departmental Committee has reported, and to pass it into law without any unavoidable delay. Its progress, however, must of course depend largely on its reception by the House and upon the state of public business.

Sentence for Theft of Ink-pot at Parliament Street Post Office.

MR. LEHMANN (Leicestershire, Market Harborough): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the case of John Baines, a dealer, who, on Wednesday, 24th April, at the Central Criminal Court, was sentenced to twelve month's hard labour for the theft of a metal ink-pot from the Parliament Street Post Office; whether there were any previous convictions proved against the prisoner; and if not, whether he will take the matter into consideration with a view to satisfying himself that the sentence was not unduly severe.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) My attention has not previously been called to the sentence passed upon this man. His record shows previous convictions of a serious character, but I will ascertain by inquiry whether these convictions were proved in court.

Cost of Upkeep of Harrow School.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): To ask the President of the Board of Education whether he can give in detail the amount of endowments spent during the last three years in the upkeep, including the cost of buildings, of Harrow.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I hope to be in a position very shortly to furnish the hon. Member with a statement as to the endowments of Harrow School and their application.

Age-Limit in the Post Office, Excise, Taxes and Customs Departments.

MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury at what age and under what regulations and conditions officials in the Post Office, the Excise, Taxes, and the Customs

Departments, respectively, are called upon to retire after reaching sixty years of age.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) In all Departments of the public service an established officer may be called upon to retire at the age of sixty. Retention beyond this age depends upon efficiency; but retirement is compulsory in ordinary cases at the age of sixty-five. These rules are acted upon in the Departments refered to in the Question, but it is the practice of the Board of Inland Revenue to require all officers to retire at the age of sixty-two, provided they have completed forty years of pensionable service and that their retirement at this age is not thought to be detrimental to the public interest.

Promotion of Second Division Clerks.

MR. CLELAND: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury how many clerks who entered the service as Second Division clerks, under the Order in Council 21st March, 1890, are employed in the Savings Bank, and how many have been promoted to the higher grade and First Division, respectively; what was the average length of service, and to what scale of salary were they entitled on promotion; how many clerks who entered the service as Second Division clerks, appointed under the Order in Council 21st March, 1890, are employed in the Estate Duty Office, Somerset House, and how many have been promoted to higher grade and the First Division, respectively; and what was the average length of service, and to what scale of salary were they entitled on promotion.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I am informed that the statistics asked for respecting Second Division clerks who entered the service under the Order in Council of 21st March, 1890, are as follows:—

Office.	Number employed.	Higher Grade.	Promotions to First Division.	Length of Service.	Scale of Salary.
				Years.	
Post Office Savings Bank Department	460	1	—	11½	£250–£350
Estate Duty Office -	101	—	9	nearly 12	£150 – £300, and thence subject to efficiency, to £500

Issue of Vaccination Order.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): To ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will state the reasons for delay in issuing the Vaccination Order, which, on the 14th February, he stated in the House was to be circulated in a few days; and if he will name a day by which the Order in question may be expected to appear.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Some questions of difficulty have arisen in settling the details of the Order which have delayed its issue. These will, I hope, be very shortly surmounted and the Order will then be issued.

Revenue Restrictions on Manufacture of Rum and Brandy.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what are the details on which the estimate is based that 4d. per gallon on rum and brandy, and 5d. per gallon on other spirit, represents the cost to British distillers of revenue restrictions on the manufacture of these spirits.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The hon. Member will find the matter discussed in Appendix No. 1 to the Report of the Industrial Alcohol Committee (Cd. 2472 of 1905).

Shortage of Rolling Stock on Indian Railways.

Mr. HAROLD COX (Preston): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been called to the allegation that the shortage of rolling stock on the Indian railways is due to the failure of the Government of India to sanction, at a sufficiently early date, proposals made by the railway companies and by the railway administration that more capital should be expended on rolling stock; whether there is any ground for this allegation; and in any case, whether he will consider the desirability of completely separating the finances of Indian railways from the general finances of the Government of India, either by creating a railway trust or by extending the system of leased lines while enlarging the financial independence of the lessee companies.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) As I think my hon. friend is aware, I have recently appointed a Committee to report on the whole question under which funds are supplied to Indian railways. The allegation referred to by my hon. friend, as well as the suggestion contained in the last portion of his Question, will no doubt be examined by this Committee.

Salmon Fisheries of the Rivers Bann, Erne, and Foyle.

Mr. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the fisheries of the Rivers Bann, Erne, and Foyle form the largest commercial salmon fisheries in Ireland and are valued under the Poor Law at over £5,000 per annum; that there is not a single person interested in salmon fisheries and resident in the province of Ulster who is a member of the special Committee who advise the fishery authority; and that the commercial salmon fisheries of the North-west of Ireland are, therefore, entirely unrepresented on this Committee; and whether, seeing that the owners of the fisheries of the Rivers Bann, Erne, and Foyle have repeatedly claimed that they should be given some representation on such Committee, and that such request has been declined, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

Mr. BARRIE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the fisheries in the Rivers Bann, Erne, and Foyle were the first in Ireland to be equipped with suitable hatcheries and are carried on in a businesslike manner; that they contribute large sums voluntarily to the funds of their respective boards of conservators for the protection of these fisheries over and above their legal obligations; whether, in view of the character, business habits, and skill of the owners and lessees or of the managers of these fisheries, he will take steps to secure their representation on the Committees; and will he say how many meetings of this Committee have been held within the last three years.

Mr. BARRIE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the views of the owners and lessees of the Rivers Bann, Erne, and Foyle fisheries, in regard to any proposed legislation which has come to the knowledge of the fishery authority or in regard to any question which affects in any way such fisheries, have been requested by the fishery authority; if not, can he explain why; whether he has received resolutions from the Salmon and Trout Association (England) and from the Irish Salmon Fisheries Protection Association urging that representation should be given on such Committee; and whether he will now undertake that representation will be given, or state why it should be longer withheld.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The proposals for legislation referred to in the third Question were brought under the notice of the Department of Agriculture, who considered them in consultation with their advisory Committee on fisheries and with representatives of the milling interests. Neither the lessees of the private fisheries mentioned nor the owners of any other private fisheries were, as such, specially invited by the Department to express their views. The observations of the Department on the proposals are in possession of the Government and will receive due consideration when an opportunity presents itself of introducing fishery legislation. The Department consider that the general commercial salmon fisheries of Ireland are adequately represented on their advisory Committee, and that that body is at present sufficiently large for efficiency. It was not the intention of the Department in forming it that private interests should be represented on it, but rather that the Committee should be composed of gentlemen generally experienced in fishery matters who, instead of specially advocating particular interests, would look upon the whole Irish fisheries as a national asset, and deal with questions submitted to them from that point of view. The Department do not intend to alter that basis of selection; but, if any vacancy should occur or rearrangement be contemplated, the question will be considered of appointing some person who, while possessing the necessary qualifications from the Department's point of view, will also have a special knowledge of the commercial fisheries of the north-west of Ireland.

Amendment of Irish Fishery Laws.

Mr. BARRIE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the proposed Bill to amend the Irish Fishery Laws has been prepared by the Salmon and Trout Association (England), and submitted to the Irish fishery authority; will he state what are the views of such authority in regard to the provisions of this Bill; and will he undertake to introduce it this session.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Bill to which the Question refers has been submitted to the Department of Agriculture, who are of opinion that, with certain modifications, it might be made the basis of a measure to amend the Irish Fishery Laws. In the present state of public business I am unable to say anything as to the possibility of introducing, during this session, any Irish legislation not already announced.

Development of Fishing Industry at Mullaghmore.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH (Sligo, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Congested Districts Board, at its meeting in January last, considered the advisability of establishing a fish-curing station on the north coast of Sligo, and arrived at the conclusion that Mullaghmore would be the most suitable site for such a station; and can he say what steps have since been taken to develop the fishing industry at Mullaghmore.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Congested Districts Board have had under consideration the question of establishing a fish-curing station at Mullaghmore, but have not yet come to a decision in the matter. They have, however, instructed their inspector to report as to the requirements of the place in the event of a considerable improvement in the herring fishery. At present moderate quantities of fresh fish can be disposed of in the district at better prices than would be given by curers.

Purchase of the Estate of Mr. Charles O'Rorke, County Galway.

Mr. HAZLETON (Galway, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners are willing, as requested by the tenants, to buy the estate of Charles D. O'Rorke, Cloonberren, Kilbannon, county Galway, which has been since 1883 in the Land Judges' Court; and, if so, what is the cause of the delay in doing so.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have, for some time, been in communication with the Land Judge in reference to the purchase of the estate referred to, and on the 27th instant they transmitted to the Judge an amended offer for the estate.

Irish Local Government Board and the Appointment of Mr. Thomas Daniel as Architect to the Bailieborough Rural District Council.

Mr. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Local Government Board for Ireland have, without assigning any specific reason for their action, twice refused to sanction the appointment by the Bailieborough Rural District Council of Mr. Thomas Daniel as architect to their improvement scheme under the Labourers Acts; whether he is aware that Mr. Daniel, under a resolution appointing him as architect of the council, carried through four improvement schemes to the satisfaction of his council and without objection or complaint from the Local Government Board; whether he was recently appointed architect to the council in connection with repairs to existing cottages and for other purposes, with the consent of the Local Government Board; whether he is aware that a medical certificate of Mr. Daniel's physical fitness has been sent to the Board; and whether he will see his way to ask the Board to reconsider their decision.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board were unable to approve of Mr. Daniel's appointment because he failed, when called upon, to furnish evidence that he possesses the qualifications necessary to enable him to discharge all the duties which would devolve upon him, and the Board have so informed the rural district council. The Act of last year requires the Board to give their approval to such appointments. It is not the fact that the Board have made no complaint regarding the work carried out under Mr. Daniel's supervision in former schemes. Mr. Daniel has recently been appointed by the council to supervise the repairs of cottages already built, but the Board's approval is not required in such case. The Board have been furnished with a medical certificate as to Mr. Daniel's physical fitness for the post of architect. If Mr. Daniel is willing to submit himself for examination the Board will arrange for his examination.

Evicted Tenants at Bailieborough, County Cavan.

Mr. SAMUEL YOUNG: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of applications received by the Estates Commissioners from evicted tenants for reinstatement from the Bailieborough, county Cavan, rural district, and the actual number reinstated.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received applications for reinstatement from forty-three evicted tenants in the Bailieborough Union. The number reinstated up to the present is five.

Sale of Estate of J. C. Delmage, of Glensharrold.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether the estate of John Christopher Delmege, deceased, situate at Glensharrold, in the County of Limerick, is still in the Land Judge's Court; and, if so, whether any steps have been taken to bring about a sale of it to the tenants under the Land Act of 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am informed by the registrar of the Land Judge's Court that all the tenants on this estate except one purchased their holdings in 1902. In the outstanding case the tenant refused to purchase on the same terms as the others. The Land Judge is now about to have the case of this tenant listed for discussion, and, if necessary, the provisions of the 40th Section of the Act of 1896 will be put into operation.

Irish Poor Law Returns.

Dr. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the resolution of the Mountmellick Board of Guardians, reaffirming its approval of the Report of the Poor Law Reform (Ireland) Commission, and stating that, in view of this Report, the board consider the preparation of Returns, extending over the entire year ending 31st March, 1908, asked for by the Royal Commission on Poor Law and Relief of Distress, unnecessary, since very full evidence, statistical and other, has been quite recently given to the Irish Commission; and, furthermore, the board is of opinion that compliance with the circular of the Local Government Board, dated 27th March, 1907, requiring daily preparation of these Returns for the year, would impose on their officials a task that would seriously hinder them in the discharge of their ordinary duties, and calls for its withdrawal; and will he say that, in case compliance with the circular is insisted on, due provision will be made for suitable remuneration to the officials concerned for this extra duty.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Royal Commission on Poor Laws and the Unemployed have informed the Local Government Board that they find it absolutely necessary for the purpose of their inquiry that they should be furnished with a reliable record of the actual pauperism of the United Kingdom for one year. Neither the published statistics of the Local Government Board nor the Returns prepared by the Viceregal Commission give this information with sufficient accuracy, for although the total number of admissions during the year and the average daily number are annually published, the same persons are in some cases re-admitted many times during the year, and on each occasion are recorded as new cases. Thus the total number of admissions during the year is largely in excess of the actual number of individual persons who obtained poor law relief. It is this latter information which the Commission requires, and the workhouse officials should have no difficulty in entering each day the particulars of admissions and discharges upon the form required for the Commission's Return. It should occupy the master a very few minutes, and is a mere matter of copying. No objection has been raised to the keeping of this Return except in Mountmellick and one or two other unions. The Return will form the basis upon which the Royal Commission will estimate the extent of the problem the State has to deal with, and the Local Government Board feel that they are bound to require it to be prepared for every union in Ireland without exception.

Holdings Sold under the Irish Land Act.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will now state the number of holdings sold under the Land Act of 1903, within the zones and outside the zones respectively, and the number in each of these classes in which the price agreed upon has been refused as excessive, down to 31st March, 1907.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell*). The Report of the Estates Commissioners for the period ending 31st March, 1907, which is in course of preparation, will give the number of holdings sold within and outside the zones respectively, and also the number of applications for advances refused on the grounds of insufficient security. Having regard to the provision of Section 1 (1) of the Act, the power of the Commissioners to refuse applications for advances within the zones on the grounds of insufficient security is limited to the cases of holdings which are included in property declared to be an estate for the purposes of the Act of 1903.

Stock Exchange Gambling.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that out of 5,400 members of the London Stock Exchange 3,000 are jobbers, whose sole business is stock jobbing and the making of fictitious prices of a gambling nature; that the 2,400 brokers are practically compelled to buy from or sell to those jobbers for any business they may have to transact for the public, and that agencies have been recently opened in London by foreign finance houses, with the primary object of gambling in stock and share operations; and whether, seeing that the number of outside brokers and bucket shops have considerably increased, and in view of the development of stock exchange loan business with the great joint stock banks, with the object of fostering international gambling, His Majesty's Government will consider the advisability of taking measures in conjunction with other Governments to protect producers, manufacturers, consumers, *bona fide* investors, and speculators from the ruin caused by international bull and bear gambling.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) His Majesty's Government are not prepared to take any action in the direction indicated by the hon. Member.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Army Pensions.

MR. HAROLD COX (Preston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has yet been able to devise any plan for dealing with those Army pensioners who cannot resist the temptation of drink, and who in consequence spend a large part of their time in the workhouse; and whether he will take care that any plan he may institute for dealing with this evil shall not interfere with the convenient arrangement of paying pensions quarterly to pensioners who conduct themselves properly.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddingtonshire): The whole question is still under consideration by the Committee under the chairmanship of the Paymaster-General.

Army Establishments.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what was the strength of the Regular Infantry (Guards and Line) and of the Royal Artillery serving with the colours in October, 1905; and what is the establishment of the same branches of the service at the present time.

MR. HALDANE: The figures for all ranks are as follows:—

	Strength on 1st October, 1905.	Establishment on 1st April, 1907.
Infantry -	159,008	147,856
Artillery -	54,724	49,613

The difference in the case of the Artillery is due mainly to Garrison Artillery reductions.

Garrison Artillery.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether recruiting for the Garrison Artillery has been checked during the last two years; whether there has been any reduction in the establishment and in the strength of the Garrison Artillery, respectively, in 1906 or 1907; and, if so, what has been the amount of such reduction.

MR. HALDANE: The standard of height of gunners for the Royal Garrison Artillery was raised one inch to 5ft. 8in. at the end of 1905, and lowered again to 5ft. 7in. in February last; this acted as a check on recruiting for this period. The figures for establishment and strength are as follows for all ranks:—

Establishment.		Strength on 1st April.	
1905–6 -	22,851	1906	22,983
1906–7 -	21,538	1907 -	20,112
1907–8 -	19,677		

Rifles for Rifle Clubs.

MR. CARLILE (Hertfordshire, St. Albans): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he would be willing to issue the old Lee-Metford or Lee-Enfield rifles, recently withdrawn from the regular troops, to affiliated rifle clubs free of charge, to be used with a Morris or other tube on miniature ranges.

MR. HALDANE: As all the Lee-Metford and Lee-Enfield rifles recently withdrawn from the troops are required for conversion and for reissue to such troops as are still in possession of the long rifle, there will not be any available for the purposes suggested in the Question.

MR CARLILE asked if a considerable number of the rifles withdrawn were so worn in the bore that they would be incapable of being used in the service.

MR. HALDANE said that those that were useless would not be converted.

MR. CARLILE: Cannot those that are useless be issued?

MR. HALDANE: I will consider that.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Is it not the case that only one fifth of the rifles that are suitable are going to be converted this year?

MR. HALDANE: They are all going to be converted; provision is made for converting a great many this year.

MR. CARLILE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that however worn the barrels may be, and unsuitable for ordinary purposes, they may be used on miniature ranges if fitted with Morris or other tubes?

MR. HALDANE: If the hon. Member will put down a Question, I will inquire.

Convictions of Soldiers on Foreign Service.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the Annual Report on the Army [Cd. 3365], page 81, what were the rank and corps of the seven men serving abroad who were sentenced to penal servitude during the year ending 30th September, 1906; will he give in each case the offence or offences for which each man was tried, the sentences inflicted, and when, where and by whom they were tried, and also the names of the persons who confirmed the sentences; whether the evidence has since been submitted to the Judge Advocate General; and if he sanctioned each sentence.

MR HALDANE: The information is too long to read out to the House, and I will have it printed in the Votes and Proceedings.†

MR. LEA: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the statistics affecting India as well?

MR. HALDANE: I will consider that.

Army Courts Martial.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the Annual Report on the Army [Cd. 3365], page 84, what were the three infantry battalions and the three cavalry regiments with the greatest number of courts martial during the year ending 30th September, 1906, specifying the number in each case, and also the respective percentages of men tried to average strength.

MR. HALDANE: My military advisers are strongly of opinion that to publish the crimes of certain battalions and regiments would not be conductive to *esprit de corps* and would be in every way inadvisable. In this view I concur. The state of discipline in all regiments and battalions is very carefully watched.

MR. LEA: If that is the view the right hon. Gentleman takes, how is it possible for any Member of this House to ask Questions as to any battalion or regiment in which crime is predominant to an abnormal extent?

MR. HALDANE: If crime is really predominant to an abnormal extent, any Question addressed to me will have the closest attention; but it is not, I think, desirable to ask roving questions.

Soldiers and Education.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the Annual Report on the Army [Cd. 3365], page 105, whether he can see his way to offer pecuniary rewards to non-commissioned officers and men on their obtaining first and second class certificates of education; and whether, in view of the improvement effected in shooting by giving money rewards, he will consider whether the same effect would be achieved in the direction of better education, thus enhancing the soldiers' chances of obtaining civil employment on leaving the Army.

MR. HALDANE: The advantages in the matter of promotion which accrue to soldiers from the possession of first and second class certificates of education are considered to be sufficient attraction to induce men to obtain them. This view is clearly borne out by the large increase in the percentage of men in possession of certificates, as shown on page 106 of the Report. With regard to the second part of the Question, committees have been formed in the various commands with a view to arranging for the instruction of soldiers in various trades; while in Army schools, men in possession of first-class certificates are given the opportunity of studying certain subjects which are likely to be useful to them in civil life. It is hoped that the prospective advantages which these increased facilities for education offer to the soldier will foster a spirit of self-endeavour, and it is considered undesirable to introduce the artificial stimulant of a pecuniary reward.

South African Constabulary.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether Lord Roberts, on the conclusion of the South African War, proposed that a local force of 12,000 constabulary should be raised for the maintenance of order in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, to be paid for by the Colonies concerned; whether that force has since been cut down to 4,500 men or less; and, if so, whether the reduction of this proposed constabulary force has had any effect in determining the magnitude of the military garrison maintained at the expense of the British taxpayer.

---

† See Cols. 495-6.

MR. HALDANE: The South African Constabulary is a force maintained entirely for police purposes. At the time of its formation in October, 1900, it was recruited, I understand, on the advice of Lord Roberts, up to a strength of 10,000. Since then the authorities in the Colonies concerned have reduced the numbers until they now stand at about 3,100.

British Garrison in South Africa.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the total force of British troops now stationed in South Africa; whether the retention of those troops abroad involves the maintenance, under the linked-battalion system, of an equal, or approximately equal, number of troops at Home; what is approximately the nominal strength of this Home force; and what is the total cost to the British taxpayer of the troops in South Africa, and of the linked force maintained at Home.

MR. HALDANE: The total force of British troops now stationed in South Africa is about 16,350 of all ranks, and its cost to the British taxpayer about £2,310,000. The troops of all arms at home fulfil the double purpose of maintaining the forces abroad and furnishing an expeditionary force; and under any system some Home force must be maintained for these purposes. The linked-battalion system, which applies only to Infantry, aims at organising the Infantry at Home in as many battalions as are maintained permanently abroad; but there is at present an excess of six battalions abroad. For these reasons I am unable to earmark any definite number of troops at home as maintained in consequence of the retention in South Africa of the present garrison.

Sir Percy Fitzpatrick and the British Garrison.

MR. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the statement made by Sir Percy Fitzpatrick, during the recent Transvaal elections, to the effect that he was in favour of keeping British troops in the Transvaal after the grant of self-government, because they were good for trade and were not paid for by the Transvaal; whether the British troops now in the Transvaal are retained there for any other purpose than the benefit of local trade, if so, what is that purpose; and whether there is any prospect of the establishment of a Colonial force to serve that purpose.

MR. HALDANE: My attention has not been drawn to the statement alluded to in the first part of the Question. The British troops in the Transvaal are not retained there for the benefit of local trade but for purposes of Imperial defence. As regards the last part of the Question, I have no information to give my hon. friend.

Fife Garrison Artillery—Gunner Crossan.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the accident which occurred to Gunner Crossan, of the Fife Royal Garrison Volunteer Artillery, on 13th April, who received the effects of a blank cartridge, fired from a rifle, in the face; and whether he will grant him adequate compensation for the accident.

MR. HALDANE: My attention has been drawn to this unfortunate incident which appears to have been quite accidental. The question of compensation will be as favourably considered as is possible.

Volunteers and the New Army Schene.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he intends to do away with any Volunteer battalions under the new scheme, or change the nature of any of the units of the Auxiliary Forces; and, if so, whether this duty will be relegated to the county association.

MR. HALDANE: Under the scheme it is proposed that the Army Council shall notify its requirements for each locality to the county associations. The associations will then in, conjunction with the Army Council, work out the most suitable arrangements to meet those requirements which will involve in many cases the changing of the nature of existing units in the Auxiliary Forces.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY asked whether he was clearly to understand that this unpopular duty would be relegated to the county associations.

MR. HALDANE said not necessarily to them alone. Primarily it would rest with them, but half of these associations consisting of commanding officers would consider the arrangements in conjunction with the Army Council and the chief of the staff and also, no doubt, with local commanding officers.

Garrison Artillery Militia.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if gun practice will be dispensed with in the case of all the Garrison Artillery Militia during their forthcoming training, and that in consequence no gun ammunition will be issued to any of them.

MR. HALDANE: The reply is in the affirmative.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Why are the Militia to be called up for training at all, if they are to have no practical experience in shooting?

MR. HALDANE: This is simply a stage of the conversion scheme for which we are asking the sanction of the House. We are drilling them, but it would be useless to set them to guns which are obsolete.

MR. ARTHUR LEE: Then they are Field Artillery in an embryonic form?

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Are they to be made into Field Artillery?

MR. HALDANE: Yes. They are to be converted into Field Artillery because their functions are to be fulfilled by the Volunteers.

New County Association Schemes.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the difficulty the House will be placed in when discussing certain portions of the Army Bill in Committee, he will be prepared to issue some model scheme for the future constitution and duties of the proposed new county associations, especially with respect to their relations with the Army Council and the powers of control that body will have over the associations, irrespective of the financial control, if they do not carry out their duties in an efficient manner.

MR. HALDANE: The broad features of the future constitution and duties of the county associations are described in the Territorial Forces Bill. Details will necessarily vary according to the local conditions; upon the relations of the associations with the Army Council I propose to make a statement in Committee.

Honorary Rank on Retirement.

SIR ROBERT HOBART (Hampshire, New Forest): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will give consideration to the claims of those colonels whose prospects of promotion and pensions were injured by the Royal Warrant of 1st January, 1901; whether he will give due weight to the promise made by the late Mr. Stanhope, when Secretary for War, duly recorded at the War Office, on which these officers have relied, *i.e.*, that the system of promotion by selection to fill an appointment would not be brought into force until the number of general officers on the active list was reduced to 100, which limit has never been reached; whether, as all these colonels are purchase officers, he will also remember the promise of the late Mr. Gladstone that he would rule any doubt in their favour; and whether, as the number of these colonels is now small, all of whom held important appointments at Home during the South African War, he will at least grant their promotion to the higher honorary rank of major-general, even if financial exigencies preclude the possibility of the higher pension as major-general.

MR. HALDANE: The decision to abolish the honorary rank of major-general on retirement was the result of a very careful and prolonged consideration of the various issues involved. This decision was subsequently reconsidered and ultimately maintained by my predecessors, and I am not prepared to depart from the conclusions at which they arrived.

Sir ROBERT HOBART: I will take an early opportunity of drawing attention to this matter.

Hamilton Barracks.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that valuable seams of coal exist under the barracks at Hamilton; that the War Office authorities have always hitherto followed the policy of neither working the coal themselves nor letting anyone else work it; and, seeing that coalmasters are at the present moment willing to purchase and work this coal at prices which would in a few years provide several sets of cavalry barracks for Scotland, whether he proposes to consider proposals for working this coal.

Mr. HALDANE: I am aware of the existence of seams of coal under Hamilton Barracks. Leases extending from 1880 to 1901 have been given to extract one-third of the coal; the extraction of further amounts would lead to the collapse of the barracks. The War Department received about £5,500 during these leases, and would receive about £11,000 if the remaining two-thirds were to be extracted—but on the other hand would lose the existing barracks.

The Woolwich Arsenal Discharges.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether arrangements have been made to work the Woolwich Arsenal on five days per week only; if so, will this entail the re-engagement of some men already discharged or under notice; and what will be the monetary loss per head per week to those at present employed.

Mr. CROOKS (Woolwich): Has the right hon. Gentleman any information to give us also about the alleged dismissal of 3,000 men after the promise given last week?

Mr. HALDANE: I had this morning, when I read the statement in the newspapers, no information whatever, and I have endeavoured to find the source from which the report, which professed to be authorised, proceeded. I have been unable to do so. It was certainly not sanctioned by the War Office, and I have sent out an official contradiction this afternoon. There is no truth in it of any sort or kind. As we have already indicated, about sixty men per week at present will be the rate of dismissal. In answer to the hon. Member for Darlington, I have to say that arrangements have been made to close most of the shops in the Arsenal on Saturdays, commencing from the 4th prox. This will not entail the re-engagement of any men already discharged. The monetary loss to men on day-work will be about one-tenth of their rating. The reason of the arrangement is that the men were very properly desirous to agree to a certain shortage of work rather than let their comrades be discharged.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Can the right hon. Gentleman tell us for how many weeks these dismissals of sixty men per week will go on?

Mr. HALDANE: They will certainly go on into the summer. It is impossible for me to say how many weeks.

Mr. CROOKS: Has the minimum yet been fixed?

Mr. HALDANE: No.

Mr. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of doing what most big industries do in similar circumstances—placing the men on short time?

Mr. HALDANE: The men have been willing to go on short time in order to avert the discharges, and I think the arrangement is in practical working order.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: May we understand that the 3,000 may still be correct?

Mr. HALDANE: No, there is no intention of the immediate dismissal of 3,000 or 4,000 men, nor has any number been fixed upon as the ultimate limit of the establishment. We are not working out anything at haphazard. Our purpose is to get an establishment in time of peace which will expand in war to what we may require. That entails, obviously, keeping a certain amount of surplus machinery idle in time of peace, and keeping a strong staff, so that the establishment may be a nucleus of the minimum establishment required. What is the minimum staff required to keep that establishment effective we do not know, but when we have ascertained it we shall not allow it to sink below that. The reason of these reductions is that the enormous establishment of 1902 was due to the necessity of making up for the wastage of munitions of war. The late Government reduced the establishment by about 5,000 or 6,000 men. I have reduced it by about 1,300, and I shall have to reduce it still more to get back to the proper minimum. How far I shall have to go is being carefully worked out by the best expert assistance at command. I have watched it myself, but I am not yet in a position to say what the extent of the reductions will be, and I do not wish to excite any hopes that I may not be able to fulfil afterwards.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): Are there at the present time quite 2,000 fewer men employed than there were in 1898?

MR. HALDANE: I cannot give figures from memory, but the hon. Member will remember that 1898 was a time when we had been making preparations for the Nile and other small expeditions, and there was an immense deal of military work on hand, although the great war had not commenced.

The Nairobi Incident.

MR. CARLILE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that no proceedings were taken against Captain Grogan and those associated with him in the Nairobi incidents for a week, and that they were not arrested until nine days after the chastising of the natives, to which exception was taken; and will he say whether the issue of summonses, and the subsequent arrests, were the result of instructions from the Colonial Office.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): With regard to the first part of the hon. Member's Question, the natives were flogged on Thursday, 14th March, and on Tuesday, the 19th, summonses were issued against Captain Grogan and his associates to appear on Monday, the 25th, With regard to the second part of the hon. Member's Question, no instructions were sent from the Colonial Office, but in one of his telegrams the Secretary of State said that he presumed that legal proceedings had been taken against the ringleaders, and the Acting Commissioner replied that summonses had been issued.

MR. CARLILE: May we take it that the arrests were the result of recommendations made by the right hon. Gentleman?

MR. CHURCHILL: As far as I am aware, it is exactly the contrary.

St. Lucia Riots.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can give information as to the nature and extent of the riots in Castries, St. Lucia; whether one of the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company's vessels has been sent from Barbados with a detachment of Volunteers; whether any of His Majesty's warships have been ordered to proceed to Castries; and what steps are being taken to restore order.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): At the same time may I ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is able to give the House any information respecting the recent riots at St. Lucia and the present state of affairs in the island.

MR. CHURCHILL: I will supplement the information as to the disturbances in St. Lucia which has already appeared in the Press by reading two telegrams from the Governor of the Windward Islands which were received the first on Saturday afternoon and the second yesterday afternoon:—

"One hundred armed police under command of Inspector-General of Police arrived from Barbados, twenty-eight from St. Vincent. I rode to Dennery factory this morning, buildings undamaged, large amount of stock killed, some canes burnt down. Hearing that large body of looters were at village three miles distant, I galloped immediately with private secretary, and arrived in time for prevention of further disturbances. Armed police arrived and arrested several prisoners. Leaving detachment, main body marched to factory with me, no firing, no lives lost."

"27th April. Situation improved, but Dennery factory and district greatly disturbed. I returned to-day, leaving Inspector-General of Police and ninety Barbados armed police in district. Have despatched St. Vincent armed police under special service officer to protect Roseau factory. Must keep Barbados armed police until arrival of 'Indefatigable.' No further assistance required."

The Governor has been asked to report fully as to the causes and particulars of the riots as soon as the crisis is over.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): Can the right hon. Gentleman say when this warship is likely to arrive ?

MR. CHURCHILL: I should say it will arrive to-morrow or the day after—I should think not later than the day after to-morrow.

Foreign Office Messengerships.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs how many appointments have been made at the Foreign Office since January, 1906, to permanent messengerships; and what was the occupation of the individual men prior to appointment.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury, for Sir EDWARD GREY): No appointments have been made since 1905.

"The Mikado."

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any complaints have been received from Japan protesting against the playing of the Mikado in London; have any steps been taken; and will the provinces be affected.

MR. RUNCIMAN: No representations have been made, but I am informed that the Lord Chamberlain has withdrawn the licence which was issued many years ago. The withdrawal affects all theatres, including the provinces.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: Does the prohibition extend to Ireland ?

MR. RUNCIMAN: My information is that the licence has been withdrawn.

Turkish Customs.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the protocol agreeing to the increase of the Turkish customs has been signed; and whether the assurances received by the British Ambassador constitute an effective guarantee of the performance of the reforms in the customs administration.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The protocol has been signed. His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople has assured himself that the obstructions, which it was feared would be raised to the execution of the customs regulations, have been removed. Papers will now be laid as soon as possible, which will explain the conditions fully.

Aliens.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a presentment of the Grand Jury of the Central Criminal Court, on Tuesday, 23rd April, to the effect that they, the Grand Jury, being impressed with the number of cases in which aliens appeared, were unanimously of opinion that the exclusion of undesirable aliens and the deportation of others from our shores should be more rigidly enforced; whether he is prepared to give favourable consideration to these recommendations; and what action he proposes to take in the matter.

SIR W. EVANS GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the presentment handed by the Grand Jury to the Recorder at the Central Criminal Court on the 23rd instant, animadverting upon the number of cases in which aliens appear, and expressing the unanimous opinion that the exclusion of undesirable aliens and the deportation of others from our shores should be more rigidly enforced; and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): I have seen a newspaper report to the effect indicated, but have received no communication from the Court. If the presentment is submitted to me I propose to ask that I may be favoured with a statement of the facts and figures on which it was based. In the meantime I may point out, as regards the expulsion of aliens, that the matter rests largely in the hands of the Court. A certificate from a Court is a condition precedent to expulsion under the Act. During the sixteen months that the Act has been in force, only twenty-three certificates have proceeded from the Central Criminal Court, twenty-one in 1906, two since the beginning of the present year. In eight cases expulsion orders have been made; in the remaining fifteen cases the sentences of imprisonment have not yet expired. As regards the exclusion of undesirable aliens I am carrying out the provisions of the Act.

MR. BYLES (Salford, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether the proportion to population of alien criminals is as great as or greater than that in the case of British criminals?

MR. GLADSTONE: I have made no calculations as to that.

Purley Railway Outrage.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to a murder committed on the 24th instant in a railway carriage on the South Eastern and Chatham Railway between Tattenham Corner and Purley stations; and what steps he proposes taking in order to protect the public from scoundrels who are attracted to race meetings in close proximity to the metropolis.

MR. GLADSTONE: As this Question arises out of and depends upon a criminal charge now pending before the Courts, it is clearly impossible for me to discuss the matter.

Employment of Young Persons.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what steps he has taken to bring under the notice of the employers affected the provisions of No. 680 of the Statutory Rules and Orders of 1906, prohibiting the employment of young persons under the age of 16 in certain industries without a certificate of fitness, more particularly in the boot and shoe industry, so far as it is dealt with in the Order.

MR. GLADSTONE: The Order was sent to 346 representative associations of employers and of workers in the trades specified in the Order, including the federations and local associations of boot and shoe manufacturers, and the unions of boot and shoe operatives. About 800 copies were sent to the Press and to Public Departments. A large number of copies have been distributed to occupiers of workshops affected by the Factory Inspectors, who have also drawn attention to the requirement at their visits. Notice of the requirement will also appear in the new edition of the Abstract now in preparation—and special attention is to be drawn to it in a circular which will shortly be sent out to every factory and workshop occupier with a copy of the new Abstract and other papers.

Assistant Factory Inspectors.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the instructions under which district inspectors of factories assign duties to assistant inspectors, and those which define the scope and limits of the duties of assistant inspectors, both before and after the alterations which he has recently made in those duties.

MR. GLADSTONE: I am afraid I can add nothing at the present time to the reply on this subject which I gave to my hon. friend on the 18th February last.† As I then said, the new arrangements are, of course, provisional, and experience of their working will no doubt suggest developments.

Jones' Homes, Sandgate.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the occupants of the Jones' Homes at Sandgate, numbering about 200 souls, are deprived of all religious ministration; and whether he would take steps to remedy this state of things, in view of the fact that they are mostly Poor Law invalids and consequently entitled to it.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxix., 551.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I have made inquiry on this subject, and am informed that it is not the case that the patients in these homes are deprived of religious ministration. I understand that a clergyman of the Church of England has visited them regularly, both on Sundays and weekdays, for some months past, and that he has also given services in the homes regularly on Sunday evenings. It is further stated that a Roman Catholic priest has visited the homes from time to time for some years past, that there are a number of persons who are continually visiting the homes and giving religious teaching to the inmates, and that if a patient who is ill expresses a wish to see a minister of any denomination, one is immediately called in. It is added that the majority of the inmates are sufficiently well to attend service at the places of worship in the town, and that, if they desire it, they can do so.

Equalisation of London Rates.

DR. COOPER (Southwark, Bermondsey): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has decided what he intends to do *re* the question of the equalisation of London rates; and, if so, whether he will state by what means he intends to deal with the question this year.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I am not at present in a position to make any statement on this subject; but I shall not lose sight of it.

Parish Overseers and the Workmen's Compensation Act.

MR. HUNT: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether a payment for insuring a parish council clerk or an assistant overseer against accident under the Workmen's Compensation Act would be passed by the Local Government Board auditor or allowed by the Local Government Board; and whether a rate, exceeding the statutory limit of 6d. in the pound, could be levied to discharge a liability under the Workmen's Compensation Act to such person or persons or their dependents, or out of what fund, if any, would compensation be payable.

MR. JOHN BURNS: If any charge appeared in the accounts of a parish council in respect of the insurance against accident of an assistant overseer who was also their clerk, the auditor would have to consider whether the charge was legal. I cannot say what view he might take in any particular case, and I should have no jurisdiction in the matter except on an appeal against his decision. I may, however, state that, as at present advised, it does not appear to me, speaking generally, that the parish council would be liable to pay compensation under the Act in such a case as that referred to. There is no provision in the Act to authorise the levy of a rate by the parish council in excess of the statutory limit.

Employment of Aliens in East London.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the fact that in the East End of London, particularly among cabinet makers, employment is only given to aliens, and that at certain of these establishments notices have been at times exhibited calling for labour, but adding that no English need apply; and whether he can take any steps to prevent this interference with the rights of English labour to work in England.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport): We are of course aware that many aliens are employed in certain industries in the East End of London, including branches of the cabinet making trade, but we have no information as to the alleged notices alluded to by the hon. Member beyond a vague allusion in a newspaper. If the hon. Member has any specific cases within his knowledge I shall be glad if he will furnish us with them.

MR. BYLES: Has the attention of the hon. Gentleman never been called to notices much more frequent in this country, "No Irish need apply?"

[No Answer was returned.]

Argentina Tax on Commercial Travellers.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been directed to the taxes imposed on commercial travellers in Argentina, which prejudicially affect British trade; and whether he will open up negotiations with the Argentine Government with a view to the removal of these imposts.

MR. KEARLEY: The attention of the Board of Trade has on various occasions been directed to the taxes in question. They are, however, imposed on all commercial travellers, without distinction of nationality, and are not therefore specially directed against British trade. My right hon. friend will, I understand, consult the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs as to the expediency of negotiating with the Argentine Government on this subject.

Cliff Ladders for Shipwrecks.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the fact that at a recent shipwreck the height of the cliff, some 300 feet, prevented the traveller and basket working with freedom, cliff ladders will be supplied to such coastguard stations where they would be likely to be of use in saving life.

MR. KEARLEY: Cliff ladders are supplied to life saving stations on the coast upon the recommendation of our inspectors and coastguard officers. Such ladders have now been requisitioned and supplied to Hope Cove, where the wreck of the " Jebba " recently occurred.

Secondary Education.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the information in the possession of the Education Department regarding the endowments available in England and Wales for secondary education is sufficiently complete for any county or counties to be of use if published; and whether he will grant a Return giving such information.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): I regret very much that the information in the possession of the Board is not at present collected into a form in which it could be usefully published, even for a single county. A Return of Endowments involves the examination and classification of a very large mass of material by persons possessing special technical knowledge, and, if it is to be efficiently and economically carried out, cannot be undertaken without due preparation. I have no doubt that a summary Return (on the lines of some Reports recently made relating to endowments applicable to purposes of elementary education in the counties of Stafford and Northants) would be of great value, and it is my intention to undertake the work as soon as possible. It will, however, be difficult to make much progress until the staff of the Board are transferred to the new offices.

Income-Tax Refunds.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Revenue authorities have declined this year to return to Messrs. Swinburn, Green, and Herron, of Stanley, county of Durham, the income-tax on the bank interest earned in connection with thirty miners' cottages built by them; whether he is aware that the interest was returned in previous years, and that the only reason given for departing from the practice is that the investment was speculative; whether he is aware that the houses were built to be retained and not to be sold, and, if so, on what grounds the investment is held to be speculative; and whether, having regard to the fact that the assessed income of the property is £304, and that the Revenue has received income-tax on £415, he will give directions for the overcharge to be refunded.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The claim in question was refused on the ground that the interest was paid in respect of a single speculative transaction, in which case the Board of Inland Revenue do not recognise any title to repayment of income-tax on the part of the person paying the interest. If, however, as is now understood to be the case, the building operations have ceased and each of the gentlemen named is in receipt of a fixed share of the rents from the property, which is duly assessed to income-tax under Schedule A and out of which the interest is paid to the bank, the Board of Inland Revenue inform me that they will be prepared to consider a claim for repayment of the tax on such interest, provided they are satisfied that the claimants have borne tax upon the whole of their incomes. I understand that the Board is in communication with the claimants on this subject.

National Physical Laboratory.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state approximately the amount of fees received during the past three years by the National Physical Laboratory in respect of work of the class which, prior to the establishment of the Laboratory, was carried out at Kew; and whether this branch of the work done at the Laboratory was self-supporting in the sense that the Kew establishment was, with the aid of the Gassiott fund.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I am informed that the fees received during the past three years for work of the class which previously to the establishment of the Laboratory was carried on at Kew, excluding, that is, merely chemical tests and the ordinary engineering tests on materials of construction, have amounted to £3,680 13s. 8d., £4,225 12s. 9d. and £4,645 3s. 9d. respectively. The Answer to the second part of the Question is in the negative. The character of the work conducted at the two establishments is so different that I do not think a fair comparison can be made.

Board of Agriculture Staff Salaries.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury on what grounds it is considered that the salaries paid to the staff of the Board of Agriculture are adequate for the requirements of that Department; what was the last occasion on which the scale of salaries in force was revised; and whether he is aware that the many fresh duties imposed on that Department by legislation have been of an onerous character.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I fear I cannot explain in answer to a Question the various considerations which guide the Treasury in deciding on applications for increased scales of salary in the public service. The last revision of salaries in the Board of Agriculture took effect from the 1st April, 1906. I am unable to say whether the fresh duties imposed on the Department by legislation can properly be described as "onerous."

The Under-Secretary of State for War and his Tenants.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether his attention has been drawn to a letter from a large landowner in Hampshire to one of his tenants stating that, if this or any other tenant insisted upon their power under the Ground Game Act of constantly disturbing the land in pursuit of ground game, he would change his tenant; whether he is aware that the tenant in question had held a farm on this estate for over thirty years, and, in consequence of having exercised his legal rights under the Ground Game Act to protect his crops, was driven from his farm and thereby incurred a serious pecuniary loss; and whether the Board of Agriculture will consider what steps can be taken to protect the interests of the tenants referred to.

MR. J. WARD asked the hon. Baronet in his reply to state whether the large landowner referred to was the Earl of Portsmouth, the Under-Secretary of State for War.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, S.): We have no knowledge of the facts of the matter to which my hon. friend refers, and this being the case I cannot say whether it be possible for the Board to intervene in any way with respect to it. Perhaps my hon. friend will furnish me with any information on the subject which he may possess.

MR. LEA: Has the hon. Baronet not received a private letter from me on the subject, acquainting him with the facts of the case and the name of the noble landowner in question?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: It is true the hon. Gentleman was good enough to write to me referring to the newspaper called *Truth*, but up to now I have not had an opportunity of seeing it.

MR. LONSDALE: Will the hon. Baronet now make inquiries as to who the particular nobleman is?

MR. LEA: May I ask the Prime Minister, in view of his recent vigorous speech on land reform, which contained a scathing allusion to the growing excess of game preservation and the supposed rights of landowners over pheasants and hares, whether he does not consider it incompatible with his expressed views that a noble landowner like the present Under-Secretary of State for War should continue to hold office in this democratic Government?

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): Only five minutes ago I was not aware of any of the alleged circumstances in this case, but the opinions I have expressed are my opinions, and I hold to them. We must know a little more about the matter before we proceed to take action.

MR. LEA: And if the facts are as stated, will the right hon. Gentleman——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. That is a purely hypothetical question which cannot be put.

Paisley Licensing Case.

MR. LEA: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if his attention has been drawn to the remarks made by Sheriff Darling Lyell in regard to the case at Paisley, where two of the local magistrates, one a joiner named M'Naughton and the other a plumber named Kilpatrick, reported on structural alterations necessary at a licensed house, and where the joiner who undertook the reconstruction of the premises was the very Mr. M'Naughton who, in his capacity as magistrate, had ordered the work to be done to his own satisfaction and that of his brother magistrates; and where not only was this so, but the plumber who contracted to do the plumbling work to the orders of Mr. M'Naughton was the brother magistrate who also inspected, reported, and concurred in requiring this work to be done; and, having in view the foregoing facts, will he indicate what action he proposes to take in order to prevent the recurrence of such an incident.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): The facts stated in the question appear to be substantially correct. I am advised that no proceedings can be taken in the case. While it may be accepted that no corrupt motive can be ascribed to the persons named, I am of opinion that their conduct was irregular and should be discountenanced.

Forth Fisheries.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware that the dredgings from the Upper Forth are emptied between Aberdour and Granton, causing destruction to the fish in that neighbourhood and loss to the fishermen; if he is aware that the Clyde dredgings have to be carried three miles beyond Cumbrae Head, a distance in all of fully twenty miles; and if he will see that this difference of treatment between east and west is remedied, and the Forth dredgings carried to the open sea.

MR. SINCLAIR: No information has reached me on the subject referred to by my hon. friend, and I am informed that no complaints have been received by the Fishery Board as to destruction of fish or loss by fishermen. If specific information is furnished it shall be investigated.

Illegitimacy in North West Lanark.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state what is the number of illegitimate births in the North-West Division of Lanarkshire for the last statistical year available; and will he say what percentage the figures bear to the rest of this county.

MR. SINCLAIR: The North-West Division of Lanarkshire not being constituted by complete registration districts it is impossible to give precise information. Taking, however, the portion of the division for which statistics are available, the number of illegitimate births in 1906 was 130 or 3·8 per cent. of the total births thus registered, while the rate for the rest of the county was 6·1 per cent.

Sir Horace Plunkett.

MR. LAMONT (Buteshire): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether the position of the Agricultural Commissioners under the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill will be of a political character; and, if not, whether, in view of the fact that the systematic development of agricultural education, co-operation, and organisation is vital to the success of small holdings, and in view of the services rendered in this field by Sir Horace Plunkett in Ireland, he will consider the desirability of inviting Sir Horace to accept the position of Agricultural Commissioner in Scotland.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The answer to the first portion of my hon. friend's Question is in the negative; and if it is his intention to assure me that Sir Horace Plunkett is likely to desire to become a candidate for one of these appointments I have to say that I shall be glad to consider the suggestion at a later date. In the meantime, and until the Bill has passed through Parliament, the Question seems premature.

Scottish Office Messengerships.

Sir SAMUEL SCOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland how many appointments have been made at the Scottish Office since January, 1906, to permanent messengerships; and what was the occupation of the individual men prior to appointment.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The answer is none.

Extractor's Department—Clerk's Superannuation.

Mr. WATT: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he is aware that an official of the Extractors' Department, who had to discontinue his duties owing to ill-health after forty years' service, has not yet received any superannuation allowance or gratuity, although it is now nearly two years since he left; and if he will take steps to remedy this state of matters.

The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. Thomas Shaw, Hawick Burghs): The Answer given by me to my hon. friend on the 16th instant covers this Question.† This matter, as I explained, depends upon rules of the Treasury, and any further question upon the subject should be addressed to that Department.

Dublin Treasury Remembrancer's Clerk.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, can he say why Mr. J. T. Drennan, on being appointed as a temporary clerk in the office of the Treasury Remembrancer, Dublin, was given a salary of £3 per week, which is double the salary usually given to temporary clerks employed in Irish Government offices; under what circumstances was he subsequently appointed to two positions (the chief clerkships, respectively, of the Registry of Titles and Estates Commissioners' offices), which posts had no previous existence and which appear to have been created specially for his advantage; whether he is aware that a number of the temporary clerks, appointed prior to Mr. Drennan's first appointment, are still serving in Dublin offices at £80 a year, while Mr. Drennan draws about seven times that amount; whether Sir Robert Holmes has shown any practical solicitude for the amelioration of the conditions under which these other temporary clerks serve; and will he investigate a state of affairs which makes it possible to reject proposals for small increases to other clerks in Dublin Government offices whilst the personal subordinates of the Treasury Remembrancer receive promotions of the character indicated.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I will answer the first part of the Question. Mr. Drennan was appointed in 1892 at a salary of 30s. a week, which was raised in December, 1894, to £2 a week, and from 1st January, 1899, to £3 a week. His appointment to the post of staff officer in the Registry of Titles was offered him by the Registrar, approved by the Lord Chancellor and the assigned judge of the High Court and sanctioned by the Treasury. The appointment was made wholly upon grounds of merit, which have been amply confirmed. As regards the remaining portion of this Question I, must refer the hon. Member to my reply of the 23rd instant.‡

Irish Land Stock Interest.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if under the Treasury rules issued in pursuance of Section 36, Sub-section 5, of the Irish Land Act, 1903, a person to whom land stock is issued in the month of March or April in any year is paid six months' interest on such stock on the 21st of June next following, although this stock has only been in existence for a portion of six months; if he is aware that Section 28, Sub-Section 1 enacts that dividends on Irish land stock, are to be paid at the rate of $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. per annum, and that payments such as described above are largely in excess of the rate of $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. per annum; can he state by what authority the Treasury are entitled to pay a greater rate than that authorised by the Irish Land Act, 1903, to the detriment of Irish funds, which were declared and intended to be for other purposes; and whether he intends to bring the Treasury Rules into conformity with the Act of Parliament, and take steps without legislation to see that no unearned dividend is paid on future issue of land stock, by notice at the time of issue that dividends will only be paid half-yearly at the rate of $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. per annum, as provided by Section 28, Sub-section 1.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 953.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 1576–8.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The Treasury Rule under Section 36 (5) prescribes the dates on which certain payments shall be made by the Irish Land Commission to the National Debt Commissioners. It does not affect the amount payable as dividend to a holder of guaranteed $2\frac{3}{4}$ per. cent. stock. The dividends on that stock are not payable on 21st June, but on 1st January and 1st July in each year. I am aware that Section 28 (1) of the Act provides that the stock shall yield dividends at the rate of $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. per annum on the nominal amount of the capital. Where a fresh issue of stock is made in the month of March or April, the usual practice would be to issue the stock with a title to a half-year's dividend on the following 1st July. The stock is in effect created as from the preceding 2nd January, and bears interest at $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. from that date. There is nothing in the Act to prescribe that the stock shall bear interest only from the date on which the subscribers' instalments are paid up. There is, however, a provision in Subsection (2) of Section 28 requiring that equal half-yearly dividends shall be paid on the due dates, which might be difficult to reconcile with the procedure proposed by the hon. and learned Member. Be that as it may, however, the practice of issuing stock to carry a full dividend on the first dividend day is the regular practice in the issue of British Government stocks; it is not a special procedure devised for the guaranteed $2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. stock; and it is adopted on the highest expert advice as being the course best calculated to secure the most favourable issue of the stock.

MR. MOONEY (Newry): Will the right hon. Gentleman issue a statement showing how the loss of £102,000 is made up?

MR RUNCIMAN: Yes; if the hon. Member will put down an unstarred Question I will circulate the Answer.

The Chief Secretary for Ireland and the Ulster Members.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR asked the Chief Secretary for Ireland a question of which he had given him private notice, viz., to which hon. Members the right hon. Gentleman referred in his speech at Halifax on Friday, when he said there were men in the House of Commons who made it their business at question time, day after day, to ask questions, not for the purpose of gaining information, but to malign and misrepresent their native country.

*MR. SPEAKER: The Question does not come within the rule of urgency.

SEVERAL NATIONALIST MEMBERS: Carrion crows! Carrion crows!

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I desire respectfully to ask you, Sir, upon what seems to me a breach of privilege, whether the Chief Secretary was entitled to say of brother Members that they ask question after question, not for the purpose of gaining information, but solely to malign and misrepresent their native country. That is a deliberate indictment of the honour and *bona-fides* of Members of this House.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: It was absolutely true, nevertheless.

*MR. SPEAKER: If that statement had been made within the walls of this House it clearly would not have been permissible. It would have attributed motives, and that is not permissible.

Mr. BIRRELL: After what has just fallen from you, Sir, may I say that the words which I find at the foot of the Question of which the noble Lord gave me private notice are a condensation of what I actually said, which was that, as questions were constantly put to me which evidently added nothing to the information of the persons asking them, or to that of the police who are responsible for the peace in Ireland, or to my information, it would seem that the only object in putting them was to create a false impression in England of the real state of things in Ireland.

Viscount TURNOUR: I apologise to the right hon. Gentleman for having taken the words of *The Times* report as what he said. Had I known *The Times* report was false I should not have put down the Question.

Mr. BIRRELL: The noble Lord may not have had as much experience as I of the condensation of reports.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: Does the right hon. Gentleman deny that he used the words? [Nationalist cries of "Caw, caw."]

*Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to ask a question of that kind without notice.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: May I put a Question down on the Paper?

*Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member will hand in the Question I will consider it from the point of view of order.

Court of Criminal Appeal.

Mr. BILLSON (Staffordshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if, in view of the interest taken in the Court of Criminal Appeal Bill, he will arrange for the Second Reading on an early day.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I hope to put this Bill down for an early day, but I am afraid I cannot state a definite time at present.

Care of the Feeble-minded.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he can state when the Royal Commission on the Care and Control of the Feeble-minded is likely to report.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have made inquiries and I am informed by the Chairman of the Royal Commission that the evidence has just been closed and that the Report will be presented at the earliest possible moment, but how soon this will be it is impossible to say.

Sir Horace Plunkett.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether Sir Horace Plunkett has resigned the office of Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction in Ireland.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The hon. Member will have seen the published correspondence between Sir Horace Plunkett and my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary, and that will give him the information which he desires.

The Imperial Conference.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he will state the reasons which have led the Government to oppose the full and immediate publication of the proceedings of the Imperial Conference on the subject of preferential commercial relationships between the States of the Empire.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No distinction is drawn between different subjects in the manner of their treatment with regard to publication. The question of publication is, as I have frequently stated, for the decision of the Conference itself.

Viscount TURNOUR asked why the report of that part of the Conference which dealt with Imperial defence and of the speech of the Secretary for War was published in much fuller detail than reports dealing with other subjects.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I understand the Conference so decided. At any rate, there has been no interference on the part of the Government.

Public Rights of Way.

Mr. HAROLD COX: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether in any scheme of land legislation he may submit to the House he will include measures for restoring to public use and enjoyment roadside strips, public footpaths, and commons that have been illegally appropriated by private persons and are now held without legal title.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The matter that my hon. friend refers to will not be lost sight of, though I hardly think it would be desirable to overload the Bills which we have contemplated by provisions such as he suggests. I may perhaps remind him that the Local Government Act of 1894 empowers local authorities to take certain steps in maintaining rights of common.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman state upon what grounds he contemplates fresh legislation in regard to land in England when the President of the Board of Agriculture stated last session in the House of Lords that the Agricultural Holdings Act, then before Parliament, represented the whole policy of the Government as regards land.

SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not see how that arises in the very least degree out of the Question.

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).

MR. STUART-WORTLEY reported from the Chairmen's Panel; That they had appointed Sir Thomas Esmonde to act as Chairman of Standing Committee A; Mr. John William Wilson to act as Chairman of Standing Committee B; Mr. Laurence Hardy to act as Chairman of Standing Committee C; and Mr. Eugene Wason to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs) rose to move as an Amendment, "That this House welcomes State action to promote small holdings; but, supporting the principle of responsible ownership in land, it believes that the Government policy should be based on purchase, and deprecates the extension of an extreme form of divided ownership to districts beyond those crofter areas where the occupier provides equipment." He said the Amendment dealt with two aspects of the Bill which were detrimental to individual initiative and failed to meet the requirements of public control. The Amendment of his hon. friend opposite dealt with a similar point on more contracted lines.† It also asserted the principle of responsible ownership. That, to his mind, was an essential principle and he would be prepared to support such an Amendment as against the Bill. In his opinion no more important question had ever come before the House, and he would like to remind hon. Members of some of its main features. On the one hand they had a depressing shrinkage in the number of persons employed on the soil, a point of supreme importance when considered in connection with the restricted area of these islands and the proportion which the country population bore to the total population as well as the extent of their external responsibilities. The landward population furnished the vital strength of the people. Among the weak points of our land system one was that in no country was there so large an area of waste as they found in Scotland. In no country were large estates and large holdings so prevalent; in no country was there such an unparalleled import of the necessaries of life which could be profitably grown at home, nor was there elsewhere any such cleavage as was to be found in Scotland between the country and town populations, and where there were so few of those living in the villages and towns who found employment on the neighbouring land. In fact, in Scotland, if additional labour was required on the land they could only get it from Ireland, and they found, he admitted, that the Irish were the best workers after all. Another feature was the large extent of land devoted to purposes of pleasure and of sport. If access to the land was difficult at times it was even more disquieting to find access to it so generally unsought, and the condition of affairs in Scotland showed how entirely divorced the urban population had come to be from the soil. The State, was nowhere so little alive to its responsibilities, whether as an educator or an experimenter, and especially as an active agent in cases where the initiative of the private owner failed. On the other hand they had the first agriculture in the world in the production of certain forms of crop; they were the first stock-raisers in the world, and in no other country was the equipment of a holding at once so complete or so costly as in Scotland. They had also an elaborate system of preservation of game. He believed his right hon. friend the Lord Advocate had given some attention to that matter. But he was not himself sure of the advantages of that form of revenue. Still, it was there, and they had to make something of it as best they could, because, after all, a considerable proportion of the population in some places had come to depend upon it. He was inclined to think that on the whole they would have been better off in Scotland if no game rent had ever been received in that country, because then they would have had to devote their attention to the ordinary products of the soil, and the industrial use of the land by agriculture would have been more advanced than it now was. Out of a total area of nineteen million acres in Scotland about one fourth was available for agriculture and one fourth for sylviculture. Apart from the urban area, they had about ten million acres which remained to be dealt with. Their objects were two-fold, first to increase the number of those that the soil would maintain, and secondly to improve the *status* of those who were there. There were three lines of action open to them, the first was afforestation, the second was intensive agriculture, and the third was the creation of small farms. Afforestation would be a means of bringing population to the land of Scotland. There were four of five millions of acres which, under a Forest Department, might attract people to the soil and this was Government work, because under no other form could they ensure that continuous good management which made sylviculture possible. There were two or three millions of acres best suited to sylviculture which might be transferred, under the schedule of the Deer Forests Commission, permanently to crofters grazing lands, that might not add appreciably to the number on the soil; it would add to the comfort of those who were already there; whereas if the area were retained for afforestation tens of thousands of families might find their living in the work of sylviculture and its attendant industries. The Bill neglected the remedy for depopulation which afforestation would afford, and unless there was some security for obtaining free right of entry upon land suitable, it would block the way to developing any scheme of afforestation. By intensive cultivation they could supplant ordinary agriculture and it would add to the number on the soil. He thought three or four acres were sufficient to maintain a family in comfort on suitable soil. As an illustration of that he would quote from the evidence given before the inquiry of James Stewart, a small holder, who was a shoemaker by trade. He rented two acres at £5 per acre about twenty-five years ago, and went into the fruit trade. Stewart's next venture was the leasing of five acres of ground at Old Rattray, and subsequently he bought this ground at £100 per acre. In a short time he had sold two and-a-half acres for £700, and held as profit the remaining two and-a-half acres plus £200. He then leased nine acres at £10 per acre, this high rent being caused by the fear of compensation claims. In 1902 he bought fifteen acres, and was now one of the occupying owners at Essendy. Since then he had leased a number of acres at St. Fink, two miles north from Rattray, at £4 per acre. That was a remarkable example of what might be done by fruit growing, on a system of intensive cultivation. Intensive cultivation could be well conducted either through local authorities, agricultural associations, or occupying ownership. Much could be done simply through purchasing land and reselling it. In his opinion intensive cultivation was the proper sphere for the local authorities. The land needed very little equipment, whereas the county council was not competent to work small farms, because of the cost of equipment and the difficulty of management; that branch of the land question could best be dealt with by a central authority. The local authority was an admirable agent, not only to provide land for market gardening but for another ultimate purpose. If the town councils could take land by compulsion at a fair market price they could possess themselves of land values, and in that way they could solve the building land difficulty. For these reasons he thought the largest powers should be given to local authorities, and there was no reason why the fullest freedom should not be allowed to the expansion of intensive cultivation. He regretted that the Bill ignored the agency of the local authority; indeed, it expressly excluded suburban land from the scope of the measure, and that was a limitation which needed explanation. Then as to the creation of small farms, he contended that if these small farms were to be used for the growth of the ordinary agricultural crops they ought to be of an economic size, say fifty acres. But by their creation they did not necessarily add to the number of persons on the soil; what they did was to add to the *status* of the small farmer as compared with the farm servant. The area available for small farms was limited by the visiting equipment, which represented the whole value of the arable land. They were dealing, therefore, not with land but with capital. The small farmers could not afford to pay the same rent as the large farmers. The small farmer might be able to compete with the large farmer if he was equally well trained, and could co-operate. It was only fair to state that small farms had held their own wonderfully well in Scotland considering the great disadvantages under which they laboured, although the work of dairy farming, which was the most remunerative form, without co-operation was but a life of grinding toil. The immediate needs with respect to small holdings were that the State should experiment with large groups of small holdings in suitable localities, and when it had been shown that they could be made a permanent economic success they would then be widely established. The large farmer was able to handle his produce in bulk, but not so the small farmer; and therefore to scatter small farms promiscuously throughout the country was to invite failure at the public expense. Groups of small holdings ought to be set up under co-operative conditions, and under a variety of tenure suitable to the customs of the locality. The cast-iron tenure laid down was one of the defects of the Bill. Tenure differed in different counties. In Worcestershire they found occupying ownership, in Lincolnshire there was mostly a yearly tenure, in Scotland as a rule they had the nineteen years lease tenure, and in the Highlands the permanent form of tenure. They had to adopt the kind of tenure which was suitable to the locality before they could put the tenants on a basis which was likely to succeed. In agriculture there was great need of object lessons, especially in regard to experiments in equipment. He believed that land could be equipped cheaper for small than it was now equipped for large farms, but until more experiments were made upon that point it would remain a matter of opinion. He noticed that there was no money provided for such experiments under the Bill, and consequently the essentials to make the scheme a success would be starved, because all the money under the Bill was ear-marked for the equipment of small holdings. The smallholder had very few enemies as yet, but he thought that he would find a good many enemies created for him under the Bill. The machinery required for England and Scotland was practically identical. There were three agencies available: (1) The agency of the State; (2) the agency of the local authority; and (3) that of the individual. He drew attention to the land programme as outlined by the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies at Drury Lane, and stated his belief that the trend of opinion, whether in the Highlands or elsewhere, was entirely in the direction of small holdings. It was very important that the House should see the English Bill before they went into Committee on the Scottish Bill. If purchase was a sound principle in the one case, it would not be unsound in the other. It would be of infinite advantage to both countries to know what principle they were definitely embarking upon. After all, though the Cheviots formed the dividing line between the two countries, they did not divide two systems of agriculture, except that to the north equipment was more costly, and tenure was more methodically arranged. The application by a central authority of its own powers, or of its pressure upon local authorities and private owners, to meet any genuine demand for small holdings was the pivot of the settlement of this question. The speech of the Under-Secretary for the Colonies had made it clear that the

---

† MR. BARNES,—On Second Reading of Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, to move, "That no Bill providing for State aid in the purchase of land can be satisfactory unless it provides for the vesting of the freehold in the State."

English Bill was to be on a purchase basis. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "They wished to pay a fair market price for land which was taken for public purposes. Private persons would imitate the State and initiate small holdings. Land acquired by the State by the use of its credit and authority could never be alienated again. Nothing could be accepted that would obstruct public ownership. No scheme could have a chance which did not combine individual incentive with collectivist apparatus."

That was a perfectly sound policy, it clearly indicated a purchase basis and responsible ownership of the land. By responsible ownership he did not mean ownership entirely in the hands of the individual, but ownership by the State or the local authority or the individual. With an English Bill on these lines they should get to work immediately. They got the requisite flexibility of tenure because that was assured under responsible ownership, and they would use the owner to the full, for he would desire to avoid expropriation. There was no reason why the £10,000,000 or £12,000,000 a year now spent on equipment by British landowners should not be spent just as readily on small holdings as on large. But that expenditure must necessarily cease under any system of divided ownership. This Bill would provide £65,000 a year to be spent in equipment, and would risk the loss of the £2,000,000 a year that was now spent by the owners, who would no longer invest under divided ownership. He was merely talking of what an ordinary business man in Scotland, or anywhere else, would do under divided ownership; they could not expect the present landowners to go on with this expenditure. With divided ownership it was more difficult to borrow money for improvements, and the value of the property was depreciated. That had been seen in one or two cases which had lately been tried. If a small holder made money on his little farm, or failed, he would wish to leave or to take more land in order to make more money. Then the owner was resurrected in order to take over the new equipment and add it to the old one left on his own hand. The State was to make gifts and advance loans in a way which made the Bill far more complicated than anything in the Irish Land Act. If a small tenant failed, he remained attached to the land until he could pay up his debt. He could hardly conceive a more complicated system. In fact, it was unworkable. It would set up a body judicial in form, but not judicial in character—an exotic authority having no place in the permanent institutions of the country. It would not be of a judicial character, because it would represent an interested party, and all claims would be settled by it. It would come under the lash of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for any loss, or it would come under the lash of the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty if it did not take up enough land. In case of failure the loss would have to fall on somebody. The Land Court proposed under the Bill would not be accepted as a judicial authority—it had some of the characteristics of the Star Chamber and some of the attributes of Paul Pry. Its business was to make the thing pay at any cost, and therefore it could not be accepted as impartial. Co-operation would be withheld. In most of the clauses there was an unlimited opening for litigation—an opening which was lacking in last year's Bill. He was dealing with people who, taking land under economic conditions, were anxious to make money. He believed that the costs of a Land Court would be a very serious matter indeed. As to the framework of the Bill, it was repudiated by the agriculturists of Scotland. It had been repudiated by the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture almost unanimously at a meeting at which over 200 members were present. He confessed that he would like to see a special branch of the Board of Agriculture in Scotland, not another dead branch of the dry administrative tree, but an organisation which would have the authority and knowledge of the Agricultural Department in London. The Bill professed that its object was to attract people to the soil; but he maintained that it would not. It was intended to raise the status of those who were on the soil. That was doubtful, because a small holder would find it very difficult to rise under the conditions of the Bill. They gave him no facilities to rise. Free sale would have to be given, so that he might get rid of his equipment and be able to go on to another farm. Why should he forfeit all protection under valued rent when he took a larger farm? He believed that free sale was an essential provision, under ordinary economic conditions, of any scheme of security of tenure under divided ownership. The Secretary for Scotland, in Roxburghshire, recognised that there must be co-operation amongst small farmers and held that this was impracticable without security of tenure; but it was just as much in the interests of the landlords to co-operate as it was to the tenants. If a central creamery or depot were put up the landlords would save enormously by not having to provide separate milk and cheese rooms for each tenant. He believed that if in Scotland they set up divided ownership with valued rents it would lend itself to bad farming, for the farm would often be run down out of condition before the valuation was fixed. It would be the Irish failure over again. The Highland tenure worked well because the people there were fixed on the soil. Suppose crofters wanted to emigrate to Canada, the Crofter Act would break down unless there was free sale. There was a real distinction between the Highland and the Lowland line. On the one side the tenant made the permanent improvements, and on the other side the landlord made the permanent improvements. He believed that divided ownership was impossible outside the crofter area. Before the Small Holdings Inquiry there was no shred of evidence in favour of dividing large farms into small holdings by compulsory leasing. Mr. Miller, who was a leader of the Land League in Caithness, like other witnesses before the inquiry, was in favour of purchase. On that principle all difficulty disappeared. If an Agricultural Commission and Land Court were set up no man would be ever able to get through the work of the Agricultural Commissioner. All holdings of under fifty acres would have to be dealt with. He would have to supervise not only the control of all holdings under fifty acres, and to have the responsibility of sub-dividing all holdings over 150 acres, but also to provide a fresh equipment by way of loan or gift. One of the leading defects of the Bill was that the land within urban areas would be outside its scope, whether holdings were large or small. He would like to see something like what they had in France, intensive cultivation within a wide radius of populous centres. Under the provisions of the Bill farms would be excluded from its operation in Scotland until the leases fell out. The restriction affecting a farm between £50 and £150, leaving the authority of the owner over it absolute, was either hostile to the main object or a mere paper restriction. If fixity of tenure was a good thing for farms below £50, was it a bad thing above £50? He thought that all these restrictions ought to be swept away out of the Bill, because they would never have appeared except for the vicious principle of divided ownership upon which the Bill was founded. The influence of divided ownership was over the whole scheme, and he did not see how the landlord could be expected to keep up the equipment whether farms came under the Act or whether they did not. He believed that free sale was the inevitable consequence of the provisions of the Bill in order to provide efficient equipment. Money must be found somehow in Scotland for this equipment. If the owners did not find it it must be found by the occupiers, who would not readily find it, and did not want to do so, and therefore it must be found by the State. If the money was to be provided by the State it would not be £65,000, but ten or twenty times that sum. The Scottish farmer was very much of the same opinion as the Scottish owner. They held that divided ownership could not be a permanent system. The promoters of this Bill had never faced the difficulty of equipment, but, like the perplexed minister, having looked the difficulty firmly in the face, they had passed it by on the other side. The finance of the Bill, moreover, deserved, he thought, the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer because some innocent successor of the present occupant of the office would some day have to find another hundred millions necessary to produce order out of chaos, and once more establish responsible ownership in some shape or another by the State, the community, or the individual. It was said that "all depended upon the members of the Land Board and the Commission," and no doubt a good deal did depend upon them. Too much. He did not think that any such power as that proposed could be given to any Department. He was not sure whether, even if the promoters of the Bill were to appoint themselves on the

Commission and the Land Court, the operation of the Bill would be freed from peril. If they were going to nationalise land, by all means let them do so; let them do so by some thoroughgoing and statesmanlike scheme; but he did object to the policy of abolishing responsible ownership. He was one of a small minority in the House who were perhaps better at working on the land than at talking about it. He had tried to make his views plain, and had asked some plain questions, to which, he had no doubt, he would get perfectly plain answers. He wanted to know why the system of purchase had been set aside, and whether the substance of the English Bill would be known before they went into Committee on this Bill.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): Certainly not. It is not before the House.

*MR. MUNRO FERGUSON said he regretted that, and in that case he thought the Bill ought to be considered in Committtee of the Whole House. Strongly as he was in favour of the Scottish Committee, he had always said that there were certain conditions under which Bills should be considered by a Committee of the Whole House, or one representative of the Whole House.

MR. SINCLAIR pointed out that he was not responsible in the least for the English Bill. The hon. Member knew the arrangement in regard to this debate, which was that it should be taken to-night and to morrow night, and that no other business should be taken, and that then the Bill should automatically go to the Standing Scottish Committee upstairs.

*MR. MUNRO FERGUSON thought that they ought to know definitely what the form of the English Bill would be before this Bill went upstairs. He was convinced that the limitation and machinery of the Bill would circumscribe the very small relative area available for small farms. At best that area was very small and if unnecessarily restricted he thought it would be impossible to give them a fair chance. The first draft of the Bill did not provide for the Land Court, and he would like to know for what reason it was introduced. No doubt most owners desired to co-operate in small holdings, but he did not see how they could, and if they did not find it possible, how were the two or three millions a year necessary for equipment and development to be found? It would also be desirable to know on what principle the gifts or loans of the Government were to be distributed, and why the local authorities were not to have compulsory powers of purchasing land at a fair market value assessed by official valuers. Again, how was the owner to be assured of his existing rent whether it was high or whether it was low, and after the seven fat years he was to enjoy, how was he to fare during the succeeding lean years? How was the money to be got for groups of small experimental farms, and how were the Government going to face the expenditure upon afforestation? On what ground was it proposed to withdraw agricultural interests from the Board of Agriculture and set up another Board in Edinburgh? One would also like to know, if fixity of tenure was good in itself, why it was to be limited to the cases of holdings below £50? And why should free sale be denied when it was really wanted if the small tenant was really to obtain facilities to rise? All the limitations in regard to the taking of land should be dropped and compulsory leasing should be abandoned in favour of purchase, while town and county councils should be utilised and a Forest Department should undertake sylviculture. Although he did not look at it as the sole solution, still he had great sympathy with the occupying ownership scheme of his right hon. friend the Member for Bordesley, because he thought if they were going to attract people from the towns on to the soil again it was only a system of ownership which would do it. He could not blame anyone for voting against this Bill as it stood, because he should vote against it himself. It was not, he might point out, always the landlord who suffered by a badly drafted Bill, but often the tenant. When the Land Tenure Bill was before the House they had a discussion which ended in the landlords getting all the Amendments in their favour inserted and in the tenants losing all the Amendments which were put down in their interest. He urged, therefore, that this Bill should be put upon a sound basis of responsible ownership, and that the limitations which it contained, and which were necessitated by its vicious principle, should be left out of it. He begged to move.

*SIR E. TENNANT (Salisbury) in seconding the Amendment, said the delicacy and importance of the Bill now before the House had drawn him from a seclusion which had hitherto remained unbroken. They had authority for saying that the position of small holders was not ideal. In France especially there were 6,000,000 of small holders who were in receipt of pauper assistance. They wished to see small holdings adopted in this country, but in order that they should be adopted they must be on an economic basis. The question arose, therefore, how that could be done. Scotland was not a new country like Tasmania, where it could be easily accomplished. In Scotland they had an ancient land tenure that was understood and which was characteristic of the Scottish nation. It must be provided in the first place that these holdings should be put on a business footing. The second condition was that there should be no element that could alienate any class; and the third that a fair return or capital should be reasonably expected. How were those conditions borne out in the Bill? The Government proposed to take good land from possibly a good landlord, who might be a poor landlord, while the bad landlord in the same neighbourhood might not suffer at all. It must be remembered the land in Scotland was not looked upon merely as capital from which interest alone might be extracted. It was regarded as a sacred heritage. The applicant for a small holding might be an inexperienced man; the Land Commissioners might erect buildings for him, and he might make a start. He could quite imagine a few bad years, and want of knowledge of the conditions of the country would leave him bankrupt. If such a man left his holding what became of the improvements? He supposed the Land Commissioners would endeavour to get their value from the landlord, and leave him with improvements which he did not want. The Bill not only transgressed the ordinary canons of commercial life, but very nearly transgressed the Ten Commandments. They used to look for protection from the Government, but compared with this Bill the nationalisation of land became a reasonable proposal. It was one thing to redistribute the land as national property, but quite another thing for the Government to redistribute land in this manner, and take the land of large owners of property without taking financial responsibility. If the demand for small holdings was not artificial there was plenty of good land in Scotland to-day which might be had by voluntary purchase. His hon. friend had shown what land had been excluded from this Bill, yet that land, surburban land, was the very land where this experiment might have been tried with the greatest success. In the neighbourhood of towns was to be found a ready market, handy railway communication, and every advantage to make small holdings a success, and with regard to intensive agriculture in the future he had the greatest hope for that form of agriculture where co-operation was possible. If the Government desired to give small holdings in Scotland they should have avoided the interminable confusion which these questions would raise when tenancies came to an end. When rights of land were taken away they should surely be paid for. He seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out from the word 'that' to the end of the Question, in order to insert the words, 'this House welcomes State action to promote small holdings; but supporting the principle of responsible ownership in land, it believes that the Government policy should be based on purchase, and deprecates the extension of an extreme form of divided ownership to districts beyond those crofter areas where the occupier provides equipment.'"—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. URE, Linlithgowshire) said the House had listened to an interesting although somewhat discursive homily on agriculture in general, and intensive cultivation and small holdings in particular. With a great deal of what the hon. Gentleman had said he entirely agreed, but it did not seem to him that it was militated against in the slightest degree by the present Bill. The House would, however, agree that they had not heard from his hon. friend any reasoned attack on the principle of the

Bill, and still less any reasoned defence of the Amendment which was proposed. He was emboldened to rise at once and make some reply to the challenge of his hon. friend upon the method, not the aim of the Bill, because the Amendment did not encroach on the question of husbandry, but was confined exclusively to a question on which he did not feel himself quite at sea. His hon. friend had commented on the absence from the Bill of what he called responsible ownership, but he would endeavonr to show that although responsible ownership in the form understood by his hon. friend was absent the valuable element to a small holder of responsible ownership was present. The hon. Gentleman had also complained of the presence in the Bill of what he called divided ownership. He (Mr. Ure) hoped to satisfy the House that there was not a shred of divided ownership in the Bill. His hon. friend had put forward as a complete solution of the problem which confronted the House a scheme of State aided land purchase, of which all that need be said was that it was a system contrary to the genius and customs of the Scottish people.

*MR. MUNRO FERGUSON said he did not contemplate a general system of land purchase. He only advocated land purchase for groups of experimental farms as a preliminary step.

*MR. URE said that limited the Amendment to a very narrow area. He was, however, afraid that as he understood it there was no other alternative to the scheme. A scheme for acquiring small holdings by purchase would cost millions of money and would, in the opinion ot the Government, need to be forced on those for whose benefit it was intended, and further it afforded no guarantee against inefficient cultivation of the land. He congratulated his hon. friend on his phraseology. He had abandoned dual ownership. Dual ownership was a vile phrase—a phrase which found no place in our system of Scottish jurisprudence. "Joint ownership" they knew, but joint ownership was not in this Bill. Joint ownership meant that without agreement or without recourse to the law courts the joint owners were paralytic on their own property. But he denied the existence of joint ownership in this measure. He did not propose to split straws or chop logic, but to inquire what were the rights of which the landlord would be shorn and what were the rights which the tenant would obtain if the Bill became law to-morrow. What could the landlord do to-day which he would not be able to do when the Bill became law of the land? The House would agree that that was a fair way to state the case. He said without hesitation that the only change which the Bill made in the land tenure of Scotland, in the law which regulated the relationship between landlord and tenant, was that it deprived the landlord of the right which he at present possessed, without giving, or indeed having, any good reason whatever, to remove a tenant; and it endowed the tenant with the right, which he did not at present possess, of remaining on in his holding unless there was some good cause to remove him. He said deliberately that that was the sole change which was made in the law of landlord and tenant in Scotland by the Bill. He was not for a moment forgetting the existence in the Bill of the provisions for enabling an impartial and skilled tribunal to fix a fair rent between landlord and tenant. As the House very well knew, the fair-rent court was the inevitable consequence of the introduction of fixed tenure. Fixed tenure, as the House knew quite well, was an impossibility without a fair-rent court. It was perfectly obvious that if the landlord was eager to get rid of a disagreeable tenant he had only to fix an exorbitant rent, and when the tenant could not pay he turned him out. Therefore the House could not say that such a change was not abolishing the right of arbitrary eviction on the part of the landlord. The Bill carried the matter a step further than the Act of last session. The Act of last session, the House would remember, left the landlord's right of arbitrary eviction untouched, but compelled him to pay compensation for the exercise of it. This Bill, on the other hand, abolished the right altogether, and correctly so; because let the House never forget that the measure dealt exclusively with the holdings which were men's homes, and out of which they had to make their living. A man's right of tenancy was absolutely destroyed, if he ceased to live upon and to cultivate his holding. He did not for a single moment underrate the magnitude of this change, which provided that a tenant should no longer, without good and valid reasons, be removed from his holding. It might be said that the objection to the change was sentimental. Let it be so. Sentiment was the most powerful motive which actuated mankind. Man died for sentiment. But then, although a sentimental objection did not yield to logic, it vanished away before the soothing influence of time. Although he had often heard hon. Gentlemen and right hon. Gentlemen opposite threaten what the landlords would do if certain Bills were passed, he had never heard one hon. Gentleman or right hon. Gentleman say that they would do those things themselves. He rather thought they did the landlords an injustice. For his part, he declined absolutely to believe that if the Bill became law the landlords of Scotland would refrain from following that fair and just policy which they had almost universally pursued in the case of their tenants. Members opposite might say why then did the Government propose to destroy the landlords' prestige. His answer was, "Sentiment," and sentiment was just as strong in the tenant as in the landlord. It was a sentiment which produced in the tenant that sense of security which enabled a man to say, "This is my house in which my wife and family may continue as long as I cultivate the land and conform to the reasonable conditions of my tenancy." The sense of security was the most powerful stimulus to the cultivation of the land. Why did ownership give that sense of security? Was it because the owner knew he had power to sell? Certainly not. Was it because the owner had power to let or to borrow? Certainly not. It was because the owner knew that he could remain on his holding, no one daring to bid him go. That sense of security was given by this Bill without establishing ownership, and if that was so, the Government had achieved the maximum of gain with the minimum of change. If the Bill became law the landlord would still be able to sell his land, to let it, to borrow on it, to clear it of tenants for a good reason, and to bequeath in his will. He would ask hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite if they could really say that a man who had all these rights left to him was deprived of the rights of ownership? Could they really say that a tenant who had none of these rights had a shred of ownership in the land? Was it not an abuse of language to speak of divided ownership as between a man who possessed all these rights, and the man who possessed not a single one of them? He went further. In spite of the presence of the tenant on the land, the landlord had the right under the Bill to enter on the land at all reasonable times; to cross the land if he had occasion to make roads; to enter upon his land for the purpose of mining and quarrying, cutting timber and cutting peat, unless the timber was grown by the tenant, or peat required for the tenant's fire. The landlord had the right to shoot, hunt, fish, and kill game, game under sixteen different categories, beginning with deer and ending with widgeon and teal. Under the Bill, if a tenant obstructed the landlord in any of these rights the penalty was forfeiture of the tenancy. He doubted whether hon. Members opposite knew of any rights which a landlord who had let his land to a tenant, possessed higher than those he had enumerated, but if hon. Members could suggest any other right which the landland ought to possess, then he undertook, on the part of the Government, that it should receive most favourable consideration.

MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E): His rents.

*MR. URE said he did not understand the hon. Gentleman. The interruption was hopelessly irrelevant. For the hon. Gentleman and his friends made it the head and front of their attack upon the Bill that it left the landlord with his rent and nothing more. It might be said that the landlord was deprived of his power of resumption of the land. Nothing of the kind. If the landlord had any reasonable cause for resuming his land connected with the advantage of the estate, he was entitled to resume it. If he intended to farm the land, to erect buildings upon it, to plant it, to use it for any purpose for the advantage of the estate, he was entitled to resume his land. Was it not a travesty to say that a landlord endowed with all these rights was a mere rent charger or rent receiver? What other rights than those he had named could they endow the landlord with? [An HON. MEMBER: The right to fix fair rents.] His hon. friend had surely not observed what he had said, that it was impossible for the Government to give the security proposed without having a fair rent court. He repeated that it was a travesty of the Bill to say that it reduced the landlord to a mere rent charger or receiver. It was no serious contribution to the debate to speak of the landlord as a mere rent receiver. Fixity of tenure was the object which they had in view, and fixity and security of tenure was the object which they believed would be achieved by the Bill. From the many things he had read and some he had heard he was bound to say that the phrase "fixity of tenure" seemed to be lamentably misunderstood. Many appeared to believe that fixity of tenure was some method by which bad tenants were irremovably attached to good landlords. Had hon. Members really examined the safeguards which were set out in the Bill, or had they considered all the conditions which were imposed upon the tenant in case he failed to carry out his agreement? If he failed to pay his rent, if he did not live on and cultivate the holding, if he deteriorated the soil, if he dilapidated the buildings which he himself might have erected from money borrowed from the Agricultural Commissioners or supplied by himself, if he broke any of the conditions imposed on him by the Land Court, if he sub-let or assigned or sub-divided his holding, if he opened a public-house upon it or if he became bankrupt, in all those events the tenant would forfeit his tenancy. Could hon. or right hon. Gentlemen opposite suggest any other conditions which ought to be imposed? He could conceive none. If hon. Gentlemen opposite could suggest any other conditions which might reasonably be laid on the tenant, they would be favourably received. That was the position and those were the rights of the landlords upon the question. He now turned to the rights and the position of the tenant under the Bill. The tenant could not sell or let or bequeath the holding, and he could not borrow money and burden his holding. He could not sub-let it, he could not exclude the landlord from the holding nor cease to cultivate it, and if he borrowed money for the purpose of erecting buildings he could not move or sell those buildings, and he would be compelled to leave them on the holding, receiving for them when he left only such compensation as represented their value to an incoming tenant. Under those circumstances he thought the House would agree that it was incorrect to speak of a divided ownership between the two either in the extreme sense suggested by his hon. friends or in any sense at all. He might be asked why he had laboured at such length to demonstrate that there was neither dual or divided ownership in the Bill. He scarcely knew why he had done so, except for the reason that the tenants had always represented that dual ownership carried in its train all those disasters which had dogged the footsteps of land reform in Ireland. He had never heard the reason why even if this Bill reeked with dual ownership the disasters which were said to have followed land reform in Ireland should concern them in Scotland. He saw in his place the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin, who possessed an unrivalled knowledge of agriculture, and a very large experience in Irish land administration. Would the right hon. Gentleman be good enough to tell them when he intervened what relation there was between dual ownership in Ireland and the disasters which had followed Irish land reform? There were some ex-Chief Secretaries for Ireland in the House, and they were told the other night what a valuable asset they were. He would welcome their intervention in the debate. If the Government denied to a tenant the right to sell under this Bill or the right to burden his holding, then they had fixed a great gulf wide, deep and impassable between the Irish and the Scottish system of land tenure. There was another feature in which the system set up by this Bill differed from the Irish, the importance of which, in the eyes of those who like himself had some knowledge of legal procedure and the expenses it involved could not possibly be exaggerated. They had provided that there should be no appeal whatsoever from the Land Court and that the procedure in that Court should be of the cheapest and most expeditious order. The Irish Land Court had cost £133,000 and it had taken twenty-five years to fix the first and second statutory terms of 300,000 holdings. In order to reduce the rents it cost the wretched tenants in legal expenses not less than the advantage they would gain for a whole year. He need say no more upon that point to convince the House how it was that Irish land reform had suffered so desperately under this colossal weight, expense, and delay. But he had never yet heard any man state in this House to what the alleged failure of the Irish Land Act was due, and panting for information he turned to the Report of the Select Committee presided over by the Secretary of State for India, when he was Chief Secretary for Ireland in 1894, upon the working of the Irish Land Acts. He did not think he would be far wrong if he said that failure could be traced directly to two causes. In the first place the interpretation of the Acts by the Land Court, whether right or wrong, absolutely defeated the intention of Parliament and saddled tenants with rents fixed upon their own improvements, rents which by universal admittance they were hopelessly unable to pay. In the second place, there was the absolutely appalling weight of legal expense which was increased enormously by the delay in legal proceedings. Those, he thought, were the two main reasons why Irish land reform had proved a failure. If he had stated those reasons aright then the supporters of this Bill had nothing to fear from the Irish example. He observed that a great English, Irish and Scottish landowner, the noble Marquess who led the Opposition in the House of Lords, speaking in Scotland not many months ago used these very remarkable words—

> "I am connected with a country which should be an object lesson to land reformers—I mean Ireland. We have had land Bills enough to paper the walls of this room. We have tribunals costing hundreds of thousands of pounds a year; we have Courts which may be perfectly honest, and doing work to the best of their ability, but which are distrusted by both parties, and now the last Government has added another and found a very large sum of money in order to extract us from our hopeless condition by means of an expensive scheme of land purchase."

Those striking sentences did not need any comment, for they stated clearly the reasons for the so-called failure of the Irish Land Acts. Scotsmen had no reason whatever to fear from this comparison. He had been asked why the Government preferred their own scheme to the alternative of land purchase. There seemed to be overwhelming reasons in favour of the Government scheme. First of all, it appeared to them that the method chosen involved the smallest change in the existing law compatible with the achievement of the objects they had in view. In the second place, and not less important, they had experience to guide them, for they had the valuable experience gained by the working of the Crofters Acts. It had been universally admitted that those Acts had produced admirable results. In the third place, the Government believed that under that scheme they had a better guarantee for the efficient cultivation of the land. And lastly, there was the cost. Millions of money would have been required to accomplish their object by the method suggested by his hon. friend, and those who knew the rigid front which the Treasury always offered to the pecuniary demands of Scotland would realise what a formidable objection was in their way. He was well aware that the experience gained under the Crofters Act was considered by hon. Members opposite as being valueless, when applied to the scheme of the present Bill. Why was it that a scheme which had succeeded in crofting parishes should prove unsuccessful in the lowland parishes? He would probably be told the reason was that in the lowland parishes it had been the practice and the custom for the landlord and not the tenant to erect the buildings and make the improvements. Assuming that was the case, why should a man be deprived of security of tenure and the incentive to good cultivation which that gave him, merely because his landlord had made the improvements upon the property? The Government lived in no fool's paradise in embarking on this project of land reform, and they were the victims of no sort of delusion, for they had studied carefully the statistics of rural depopulation It was no new phenomenon. He found that in the reign of Henry IV. an Act of Parliament was passed from which it appeared that the fields in this country were deserted, and that many people were seriously impoverished, because of the rush of labouring men seeking apprenticeships in the towns. They would all be agreed that in 1405 England was an agricultural community, primarily at all events. For generations back they had deliberately resolved that they should be not an agricultural community, but an industrial and manufacturing community, and hence the rush from the country districts to the towns had increased. They shared the opinion expressed by the Leader of the Opposition at an earlier stage of this Bill, that it was impossible to stem the tide that brought men from the country to the town, but the Government believed it was possible to check the strength of its flow. They believed that by this Bill they would do something in that direction. They did not expect miracles. They did not expect that men who had secured remunerative employment in the towns, and who had been bitten by the glare and glamour of city life, would be drawn back to the country, at all events, not in large numbers, if they could be drawn back at all. It would only be those who at some earlier period of their career had had experience and training in country life who would be induced to return. They did not expect that the wastrel would go to the country, but they very much agreed with the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords who said the other day that they should never lose sight of the fact that agriculture was a business, and that it must be carried on on business-like lines. Although they did not expect that tradesmen and artificers would be swept back by this Bill to the cultivation of the soil, they did believe that men would be kept on the soil who were there already, and that enterprising and enlightened agricultural labourers would have a career opened up to them. The Government believed, at all events so far as the labourers were concerned, that the Bill would stop that pouring in from the country to the town which they all deplored and which in all quarters of the House they were anxious to prevent, because it might be assumed that there would be no difference of opinion that the more contented people were got to settle down on the land, the more people they could induce to make their homes on the land and to make their living there, the better it would be for the stability and for the safety of the State. The Goverment were modest in their recommendations, as might be seen by the financial provisions of the Bill. They only proposed to place at the disposal of the Commissioners £65,000 a year, a sum which had called forth somewhat contemptuous comments from the other side of the House. With a modesty characteristic of Scotsmen the Government were only providing that sum to be devoted to the purposes of the Bill. A learned friend of his own who had made a careful investigation on this subject had pointed out that for the equipment of a holding of fifty acres a sum of £600 was required. He thought £400 was the figure which the Agricultural Commissioners had placed upon it, but assuming that his learned friend's figures were correct, and assuming also what he was by no means certain of that the Agricultural Commissioners would give to the small holder a sum sufficient to equip his holding, that sum would only represent 110 holders in the year. The Government had kept carefully in view in all these matters the homely Scottish maxim "Ye maun creep before ye gang." They had not forgotten that this was an experiment, and that if their expectations were fulfilled, and if the Bill proved a success, as they believed it would do, then he, for his part, did not despair of the importunity of his colleagues in attacking the battlements of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and of their securing larger grants for this most laudable object. Nor did the Government believe that by the passing of this Bill Scotland would be transformed as by the stroke of a magician's wand into an arcadia. They did not picture to themselves the landowner sitting with folded arms under his own vine and fig tree, listening to the humming of the bees, and watching the growth of his own tomatoes. Under their skies and on their soil success only followed strenuous, unremitting and unlightened toil—a hard lot some of them might think, and so perhaps it was. So it had been always. Some of his colleagues in the House might remember the pathetic words in which more than 100 years ago Robert Burns described his experience in Lochlea—"the cheerless gloom of the hermit, and the ceaseless moil of the galley slave." Most hon. Members who were accustomed to the stir and bustle, the excitement and the whirl of city life, might think that Burns did not overstate altogether the monotonous gloom of the agriculturists' life, but he was not so sure that they did not sometimes exaggerate his conditions. They were inclined sometimes to smile perhaps at the simple joys which filled up to its brim the agriculturist's cup of happiness. But, at all events, let it never be forgotten that in congenial toil pursued under reasonably comfortable conditions the intensest satisfaction was to be found. He thought that Members of the House would agree that the honey of life, its most fascinating pleasures, and its profoundest happiness, were not for the idler and the dilettante, but for the man who, whatsoever his hand found to do, did it with his might.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): The hon. and learned Gentleman has defended the measure in such a way that he has left hon. Members on this side of the House, and I suspect a few on the other side of the House also, asking themselves what, in the name of fortune, the Bill proposes to do; what is all the excitement about in connection with it. The hon. and learned Gentleman has told us that there was no reasoned attack made by my hon. friend the Member for the Leith Boroughs and my hon. friend the Member for Salisbury on the principle of the measure. Well, I do not pretend to know what the hon. and learned Gentleman calls a reasoned attack, but certainly both of my hon. friends condemned the proposals of the Bill as they stand root and branch. It appeared to me that they gave very sound reasons for the views they hold. The hon. and learned Gentleman went on to say that there was no shred of that vile phrase "dual ownership" in the Bill. I do not know about the phrase being vile, but I am quite sure about the thing being vile. I will endeavour to show that the defence of the hon. and learned Gentleman has not really covered the ground or removed the apprehensions held—as he suggested—only by Gentlemen sitting on this side of the House. I do not care, for my part, whether the thing is called "divided ownership" or "dual ownership." What we say is that there is a division of ownership which is now held in one hand, and that that division is not wisely arranged in our judgment and does not make wise provision for the future. It is a remarkable fact that this charge about dual ownership is not only not limited to this side of the House, but has been made on more than one occasion at gatherings of the ablest and keenest men amongst Scottish agriculturists. Lord Carrington was himself present at a meeting of the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture and allowed an amendment affirming the principle of dual ownership to be moved.

MR. SINCLAIR: The noble Lord argued the point at the meeting.

MR. WALTER LONG: The hon. and learned Gentleman opposite has suggested that the dual ownership charge belongs to this side of the House alone—in other words, that it belongs to the Party with which I have the honour to act. I do not think the Secretary for Scotland can have listened to the speech of his colleague. I am going to show the undoubted fact that in all the debates on this Bill—and they have been numerous—it has been held by critics who do not hold our political views that this Bill does involve a division of ownership as it now exists. The defence of the measure by the Solicitor-General has convinced me, and, I think, many others, that the Bill is even worse than we thought it to be when we first examined it. We have to look at this question from the compulsory system of hiring point of view, and that is one of the reasons why we believe that the Bill proceeds on entirely wrong principles. The Solicitor-General was very eloquent about the security of tenure the Bill would give to the tenant, and the better treatment the land would get in consequence. The hon. Gentleman knows his Scotland better than I do, but as most of the land in Scotland is under better cultivation than any other land in the world, the Government are setting themselves a very hard task in seeking to improve it. The Government believe that some little good may be effected by this Bill; but they are wiser than they were in 1894, when they were passing not a Land Tenure Bill, but a Parish Councils Bill, and when the Government of that day said that they were going to make the land gold with corn. Those of us who were in Parliament in 1881 know that the same kind of argument as that put forward by the Solicitor-General for Scotland in regard to setting up tenant-right was used to allay our fears. It was then said, "What right are you taking away from the landlord which he now enjoys?" and the Solicitor-General said that if any right was taken away from the landlord the Government would take that into consideration, such as the rights of shooting and fishing. The Solicitor-General has failed altogether to realise what is not only the most valuable, but the most important right the owner possesses, namely, the power by the right of ownership to make the best use he can of the land for himself and for those connected with him. That right is taken away by this Bill. If not, what is the meaning of Clause 7, which says that—

> "It shall be lawful for the landlord of any land and any other person to agree that in respect of such land such person may apply to the Land Court to be registered as a new holder under the Act."

But if that agreement breaks down then comes in the compulsory powers of the Commissioners of Small Holdings—

> "To report from time to time to the Agricultural Commissioners what demand for new holdings exists in any district and what suitable land (if any) is available to meet that demand."

The necessity for this I cannot perceive. I do not wish to suggest that the object of the Government is to attack the landlords. I fully believe the Government honestly desire to advance the cause of land occupation in order that people may be brought back to the land. But the Government are using compulsion in the wrong way, and in a way which will bring trouble to them in the future. They say they are imposing strict limitations upon the tenant; but surely they do not think that by setting up a Commission they will restore agriculture to a better condition or encourage people to take holdings if strict conditions are placed upon them. If the Government were going to select particular parts of the country to carry out their proposals, then the injury done to existing owners would be limited. But they are doing nothing of the kind. They have forgotten to recognise what every landlord who has tried to develop the principle of small holdings would admit, that it is a most difficult task to carry out. The subject seems to be talked about as if it were a sudden discovery—a new patent entirely the Government's own—but it has been tried in all parts of the country, and it is only with the utmost caution and care in the selection of the men and with equal care in the selection of the land that you can possibly hope to start small holdings successfully. It is incumbent upon the Government to proceed with the utmost possible caution because it is extremely difficult to do any good in connection with land reform. It is, on the other hand, very easy by ill-considered legislation to do immense harm. The Government may make this experiment and get whatever popularity they may from it; but if it fails—if the man put on the land fails to make a living of it and the quality of the land deteriorates—it will not be the Government nor the State nor Parliament who will pay for it, but the unfortunate owners of the land. Under the Bill the owners will be left with the land if it is injured, and they will have to pay the cost of the measure. The Committee ably presided over by Lord Onslow carefully considered the question, and they approved of the powers for acquiring land by purchase, and did not approve of the compulsory powers of hiring land, because they thought they would be unfair both to landlords and to tenants, and would involve a system of tenant-right in which the power over the land would be divided between two people. That must be the result of this Bill. The Solicitor-General did not contest it, and I doubt if anybody can from the legal point of view. On the other hand, I doubt if it can be disputed that in Clause 7 there will be a reduction of rights which the landlords regard as most important. There is, and must be, a general interference between the owner of the land and the tenants, not merely in regard to the selection of the land for particular purposes, but in regard to the future occupation of the holding by the tenant. The Solicitor-General has said it is hopeless to battle over phrases, and I do not wish to do so, but I would ask the House to remember that in dealing with the land problem they are dealing with one of the most complicated and difficult problems with which they are confronted. The Solicitor-General appealed to us about the Irish Land Act. It is a most remarkable fact that the whole of the Irish Land Bills recognised the existing tenant-right. The new Scottish legislation originated in the croft, and we were told that this kind of legislation ought to be limited to the crofter. Now, however, the limitation is moved from £30 to £50. In the general application of the principles and the history of the legislation in Ireland and Scotland the one followed the other in a remarkable way. The Solicitor-General has said that the only reason land legislation in Ireland has been followed by such disastrous results is solely owing to the question of fixing the rent. Thirty years ago, when in opposition, we were told that there was nothing in the legislation to deprive the landlord of any right he then enjoyed. I remember Mr. Gladstone telling the House emphatically that the Opposition were wrong in arguing that the landlord would be deprived of his rights. Now there is being given to-day a repetition of the argument. The land legislation which began thirty years ago ended in consequences which have cost this country a great deal of money. By what possible argument can it be contended that the Scottish land legislation is not being put on the same incline and will not end in the same way? We are supporting the Amendment of my hon. friend because we believe that he has indicated a better course and that the Government will be well advised in supporting it. I object to the Bill in its present form and support heartily the Amendment, not in the interests of the landlords, though I think the measure will do great injustice to them, but in the interests of all. It surely must be admitted that the Irish land legislation has divorced the landlord from the soil, deprived him of any possible interest in his estate and made him a mere rent charger. This is the direction in which the present Bill will lead us. Apparently the Government are learning nothing from the experience of the past. If the land question has to be dealt with in Scotland, it should be by a system of purchase and not of compulsory hiring. I have read through the Prime Minister's return containing the so-called justification for this step. Of what does this "official" account, in which I find nothing official, consist but the views of certain gentlemen some of whom are supporters of the Government? What is there to lead us to believe that the tenant we are going to create will be in any way better than the tenant under the existing law. I do not think this Bill is going to be beneficial to anything like the degree that you tell us. There are many parts of the country where the landlord has done his best to set up small holdings, even at great cost to himself, for which he has received little return. Would it not be wiser to encourage landlords to go on with this work and induce them to run the risk rather than let it be done by the State, who, if this Bill is carried, will have to bear the risk which will ultimately fall upon the landlords? It is for these reasons that we support the Amendment of my hon. friend, believing that it is in this direction that land reform of this kind should go. The Solicitor-General said something about privileges being reserved to the landlord. For instance, it was said that he could still charge his land. I do not know that a power to charge his land is one which a landlord will look upon with great pleasure.

MR. URE: He has the right.

MR. WALTER LONG: Well, the right is reserved. I listened to that remark with great interest because I believe that it may turn out to be of greater importance than the Solicitor-General realises at the moment, but the Solicitor-General knows that the question of the effect upon agricultural estates of legislation like that for which the Government is now responsible is forming the subject of grave and anxious inquiry at the present time. It may be true that the right to charge remains, but suppose the property which remains is of nothing like the same value? If you bring in commissions between owners and their land, and allow central authorities to speculate with other men's property, does anybody suppose that that property will retain its value or that people will in future advance the same money on the estate as they would in the past? I think you are taking a great risk and interfering seriously with the future value of the land. If you do that you will make it harder for many landlords, who already find it hard enough, to make proper provision for their estates. It is because we believe that this is an undue interference with the rights of property in the land, and that it will not only interfere with the landlord but with the large farmers in many places; that they will be interfered with not by the landlord who knows the property, not by the local authority who knows what the position is, but by a central authority with no knowledge of the local circumstances—it is because we believe this experiment has not been well considered and that it will be attended with the greatest risk that we shall certainly support the hon. Member's

Amendment. We shall support it because we believe that in wisdom and justice it is on the lines of that Amendment that this Bill should proceed.

*MR. MURRAY (Aberdeenshire, E.) said he desired to lay before the House the reason why he considered the Bill should become law. He did so not only because he represented a large agricultural constituency, but also because ever since his boyhood and youth spent on his father's farm, agricultural and rural affairs had had a deep and abiding interest for him. In speaking on this occasion he trusted his inexperience in Parliamentary debate would not be allowed to prejudice the case he desired to put forward. The Bill, as presented, proposed to deal with that class of small farmers known as crofters, but if passed into law, it would also affect the condition of the cottar and farm servant. The existing conditions of rural life in Scotland as regarded the crofter, the cottar, and farm servant were such as, in the opinion of all thinking men who had any knowledge of the subject, required amelioration and that speedily. He would take the case of the crofter first, as the class more immediately affected by the Bill. In the constituency that he represented there were no fewer than 3,922 crofts – some held from year to year and some on lease for a longer period. The rents paid ranged from £10 to £30 for holdings of from seven to twenty-five acres. In numerous cases the present tenants or their predecessors had reclaimed the land; had built their own houses and byres and had eked out a bare livelihood through the medium of the croft and such labour as the adjoining farms could provide, or through the special knowledge of some handicraft which they exercised in their neighbourhood. From this class had been drawn the cottar and the agricultural labourer—the backbone and mainstay of the larger agricultural community. Adverse conditions, however, had been operating against this class during the last thirty or more years, which had brought about the necessity of considering what should be done to overcome them. The conditions to which he referred were the constant and regular absorption of small holdings into larger upon the dilapidation of the buildings and the desire of the landowner to refrain from further capital expenditure on such holdings, or his inability to provide therefor. In one parish alone in his constituency there had disappeared no fewer than forty-four small holdings, through their having been added to the adjoining farms. The effect of such a policyor state of matters was to diminish the rural population and to increase that of large cities. For years past the rush of people from country life to large towns had been a source of much thought and disquiet to many minds, both inside and outside the House. Many people had pondered over this migration from the country to the town; the huddling together of human beings, especially of children—the fathers and mothers of the generation to follow—in the slums of many of the big cities, where the environment was such that inevitable disaster and distress must arise to the once healthy offspring of a rural race. On the other hand, the labourer in the city found from this cause that the number of his competitors was being increased by those sometimes too ill-fitted to bear the conditions and hardships of city life, with the result that both suffered and the ranks of the unemployed were unnecessarily increased. Philanthropic workers and those engaged in the administration of the work of distress committees could bear testimony to this. Hasty measures had to be passed by Parliament to remedy by artificial and very ineffective means the situation thus created. If the present state of matters was continued there could not be the slightest doubt that the situation would become worse instead of better. The agricultural worker maintained that he must remain either a mere labourer upon a farm or go cityward. The gradual disappearance of small holdings—mainly by annexation to larger ones—during the past twenty to thirty-five years had enhanced the value of those that remained to such an extent that to occupy them with profit to himself and his family was a financial impossibility. This over-competition had raised the rent of the crofts or small holdings in many cases far beyond the amount per acre paid for adjacent farms of similar quality of land, and had thereby made it impossible for the farm labourer to look forward to a time when he might by stern economy and hard living save sufficient means to raise himself in the social scale by having a holding of his own. It was not because of a desire to enter town life, but because he was driven to do so that they found such a man migrating from the district of his birth. His surroundings, his education, his training as a farm hand, all tended to retain him upon the soil, but the operating causes already mentioned compelled him to a course he would never otherwise have followed. Many hon. Members must be aware of the fatal effects on human nature when once it came to hold the belief that it was engaged in a hopeless struggle, surrounded and crushed by impossible conditions; loath at first to believe that the ideals of a lifetime could not be attained; loath to believe that the goal exhibited to boyhood and early manhood was beyond reach; what could follow but complete abandonment of the object aimed at? And so in this case the sturdiest and fittest men drifted from the soil to cities or to foreign lands. These men were as thorough practical farmers as any in our midst, toiling early and late upon the farm. They were the progenitors of large families—families that were recognised as producing the best outdoor and indoor servants to be found in any community—veritable nurseries of the finest peasantry to be found in any country. Surely it was to the advantage of the nation to retain this class upon the soil, and such he understood was the aim and scope of this Bill. It was an honest endeavour to check migration from the country; to retain upon the soil the people best fitted for the soil; to encourage the crofter to become the farmer, the cottar and farm servant to become the crofter; to encourage industry and thrift and improvement of agriculture by providing fixity of tenure, fair rents, compensation for permanent improvements, and the right to renounce the tenancy. What reasons were adduced by the Opposition against such a remedial measure of national importance? It was alleged that the Bill unduly interfered between the landlord and his tenant. Surely this was not the case. The landlord and tenant might still agree to contract as hitherto and to regulate the rights flowing from such contract as before, and landlords whose holdings were held on fair terms need not fear that any evil results would follow as far as they were concerned. But in the case of those who had rack-rented their tenants, whether through the exigencies of their own requirements or the desire to exact as much for the holding as they could in a market where the competitors far out numbered the holdings, these could not complain if the rent of the subject let was reduced to its fair value. What did the landlord give? Simply the use of the land to be operated upon by the skill, labour, and capital of others; and if, as at present, land was practically a monopoly in the hands of a few, it was but fair in the interests of the nation that the skill, labour, and capital of the tenant should receive an adequate return, at the same time, also, that the landlord should receive a fair rent for giving the use of that which by succession or purchase he had acquired. Was it to be maintained that the Commissioners to be appointed when this Bill became law would not deal fairly between both parties? As he understood it, the Land Commission fixed the rent after hearing the parties and considering all the circumstances of the case, holding, and district, and particularly after taking into consideration any permanent or unexhausted improvements on the holding, and suitable thereto, which had been executed or paid for by the landlord or by his predecessor. Was it to be maintained by hon. Members opposite that a landowner was entitled to more than that? They could not maintain that a landowner had a right to obtain a rent upon an improvement he had not effected; and surely they would not allege that Commissioners appointed by this House would act otherwise than in a fair and reasonable manner. He knew that it had been maintained that the Bill would create a dual ownership in a holding. That he denied. It only gave a landholder fixity of tenure and compensation for permanent improvements effected upon his holding. Besides, it was nothing new in Scotland for a tenant to take over the buildings and fences from the landlord under the obligation to leave them in like good order at the termination of his tenancy, paying for any defects, but not receiving payment for any amelioration. Such a state of matters existed years ago without complaint. Why should the landlord object if the position was altered only so as to secure to a tenant that which was his own? It was further alleged that the provisions of the Bill would entail hardship upon the landlord because he was obliged to pay a capital sum at the termination of a tenancy for buildings erected without his consent. To him it seemed that it would be a relief to landowners to be saved the necessity of expending capital sums upon small holdings at the commencement of a tenancy, as at present the expenditure of such sums was given as the reason for the absorption of small holdings into large farms. When relieved of this at the commencement of a new holding what did they pay? And when did they pay? They only paid at the termination of a tenancy which, if this measure answered the expectation of its supporters, might be at a very distant date, and then only the then value of the improvements effected. It was said that there was no demand for small holdings which was not met under the present system. That was not the experience in his constituency. In touring through East Aberdeenshire he had had occasion to meet all classes of men connected with agriculture, and the farm servants assured him emphatically that the agricultural labourers of Aberdeenshire could save enough money in ten or fifteen years to take a small holding, on which, they said, any man who knew his business could obtain a better livelihood than he could as a farm labourer. The crofts or small holdings most favoured by the farm servants were those of ten acres and thirty-five acres, respectively—the ten acre croft situated on the neuk of a farm, the small holder working on the farm and getting the farmer to cultivate his croft, and the thirty-five acre holding one on which the small holder could do very well when joining forces with a neighbouring crofter in cultivating the land and reaping the crops. It was impossible to meet the demands for small holdings in East Aberdeenshire under the present arrangements, and, therefore, speaking for the farm servants and smaller tenants of East Aberdeenshire, he asked the House to pass this measure into law. It seemed to him that landowners should welcome the Bill in the patriotic spirit in which it was conceived. If the Government were prepared to subsidise small holdings in the national interest upon bold and enlightened lines, it could not but follow that all interested in or connected with those holdings must participate beneficially in consequence thereof.

MR. LAMBTON said he had listened to the speech of the Solicitor-General for Scotland, and nothing could be more delightful than a sentimental Scotsman. The hon. and learned Gentleman had told them how the Bill was full of sentiment, and, in regard to the measure, he had himself been pretty well aware of what the representative of the Government was going to say before he got up. He spent his Easter holidays in Scotland, and on the 5th April, while he was there, he read a long speech by the Solicitor-General, who seemed to be agitated about some remarks by Lord Rosebery a few days before. The hon. and learned Gentleman had told them that the Bill was well thought out, that nobody need be in the least afraid that it was a Socialistic measure, and that the Bill was also a Scotch Bill. As the House knew, they had a Scotch Government in that House; most of the Members of the Cabinet were either Scotsmen, or descended from Scotsmen; and, therefore, a Bill like this was the highest possible achievement of the Government, and should be considered as of the greatest importance, though it would automatically go upstairs to the Scotch Committee. He apologised if he used the word "Scotch" in the wrong sense. Hon. gentlemen from Scotland were susceptible about the word Scotch, and he did not know whether it should be "Scots," "Scottish," or "Scotch." They had the Scottish inhabitants of Scotland, they had the Scottish corps of Volunteers, but he had never heard whisky called Scottish. Perhaps that was because it was less observed in the letter than in the spirit. He would remind hon. Members that when this Bill was first introduced they were told that it would not necessarily be confined to Scotland and would be extended to England. He lived in Northumberland, and his home was at Flodden Field; he could look on that blessed spot from his window. He had also a small property in Roxburghshire, which came under the Bill. Therefore, he looked on the question with more or less personal interest. Having some knowledge of the condition and interests of the Borders, for the life of him he could not understand why a Bill of this kind had been introduced to deal with agriculture in the south of Scotland. The hon. and learned Gentleman had asked what rights the landlord had lost under the Bill which he possessed at present, and he had interpolated the word "rent." The hon. and learned Gentleman had said he could not possibly understand that. He was not ashamed that landlords got rents; they ought to have rents. He did not know that that was the view of the Government. The land policy of the Government had been announced at the Holborn Restaurant, and the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, at Drury Lane, had made a direct attack on the principle of private owning of land in this country. The provisions of the Bill surely carried out that policy. Hon. Members below the gangway were opposed to private ownership of land, but they, at least, were open foes. But what could be said of hon. Members opposite? Theirs was very like the courage of camp followers; at the same time they had the predatory instincts of camp followers. Anyone who read the Bill would see what was proposed to be done. He did not like to use the word, but it was sought to accomplish by a side wind what hon. Members below the gangway would do openly. The arrangement proposed by the Bill was neither more nor less than confiscation of the landlords' property in Scotland. He would read a remark or two of the hon. and learned Gentleman when he spoke in Scotland. The Solicitor-General for Scotland said—

> "If the landowner did not see his way to let out the ground for small holdings, the Agricultural Commissioners gave notice to the landlord that they were going to the Land Court to get the holdings marked off and the rent fixed and the other terms arranged, so that the men who wanted to cultivate might be able to do so. The Land Court then inquired into the facts, heard everybody who had an interest to be heard, and, if they thought right, marked off the ground, fixed the rent, and other terms, and the thing was done."

If there was to be a Land Court, he would ask the Member for Northwich why should there not be a Commercial Court to look into such questions, say, as the profits on alkali works, and see what profits were proper to be divided among the men who produced that profit. When he looked at the Benches opposite, crowded with Liberal plutocrats, he thought there ought to be Commercial Courts. "Cleanliness was next to godliness," and why should not a Commercial Court inquire into the profits of soap boilers, so that the community might receive a share of the profit, and also those who helped to produce the profit? No doubt hon. Members below the gangway would be able to enlarge upon that point better than he would himself. There were to be five members of this land Court—one paid £2,000 a year, and the others £1,000 a year each. They were to be five skilled persons. One was a barrister of ten years experience. Was he a skilled person in agriculture? Another had a knowledge of Gaelic; and these five persons were to go about the country picking out the most suitable pieces of land in anybody's estate, and do things which in his opinion were absolutely tyrannous. The financial clauses of the Bill he thought would remain in the House. The only generous part of the measure was in relation to the Land Court and the salaries of £2,000 to one and £1,000 each to the others. They were to be appointed by the Secretary for Scotland, and therefore these officers would be political. Were these gentlemen likely to perform their duties in the interests of the landlords or in the interests of the tenants? Most of them knew what political pressure put on persons meant; and it stood to common sense that in talking about a fair rent being fixed by the Land Court, these Commissioners, any one of them, if their office depended on a political secretary, would fix the rent which they thought would be most popular. Every tenant of a small holding whose rent was fixed would make objection to one or other of these Commissioners, and the only consequence would be—they were dealing with human nature—that they would in their own interest fix the rent as low as they possibly could. That was the strong objection he had to these powers. There were various other things which he need hardly go through. The House would have to consider these clauses very carefully one by one. His experience of Grand Committees upstairs was that they did not get through much work. He happened to be on the Grand Committee which considered the Miners (Eight Hours) Bill, and the Home Secretary sent that Bill back to the House before it had been discussed. The Secretary for Scotland performed the same operation with another Bill; and they had no security under the new rules that Bills would be properly discussed upstairs. He hoped the hon. Member for the City of London and other Members would carefully consider this Bill. Anyone who looked into it saw the powers which were given to the Land Court. That was the way in which landlords were to lose control over their land, and it was to be done in a way which was not straightforward or above board. To expropriate landlords would not be a good policy for the country, and certainly would not increase its credit; but if the country wished to expropriate them, it was rich enough to pay for it. It was because he was opposed to Socialism and all its works that he should vote against this Bill.

*Mr. BARNES (Blackfriars, Glasgow) said that, in intervening for a few minutes in the debate, he was conscious that he should be playing a somewhat unaccustomed role, and some might think that the task he had undertaken ought to have been left to someone with a more detailed knowledge of agriculture than he possessed. He hoped, however, that it would not be thought presumptuous on his part if he offered a few observations upon the Bill, although he could not claim, nor could any of his colleagues claim, that they represented agricultural interests or agricultural constituences. They did, however, represent congested urban areas, many of whose inhabitants, having been driven by landlordism out of the country districts, had a substantial interest in this matter. They wanted to arrest the stream from the country to the town, and, if possible, make country life sufficiently attractive and remunerative, even to reverse the flow of the stream from the towns back to the healthy and wholesome life of the country. He desired to give to the House a figure in order to impress hon. Members with the magnitude of the problem they had got to face, and then it would be seen that, after all, this Bill, good as it was so far as it went, only touched the fringe of the immense problem which surrounded it. In Scotch towns there were 135,864 families living in one-room tenements and 287,000 families living in two-roomed tenements; in other words, one-fourth of the population of Scotland lived in one and two-room tenements. That was a fact which they ought seriously to consider. They should endeavour to ascertain the real cause of this immense shifting of population and the congestion of urban areas. The Leader of the Opposition had said that this was due to free trade, but he would remind him that the depopulation of the rural districts was a phenomenon which was not confined to this country, but was to be found in all parts of the world. In protectionist countries like France and Germany the crowding of the people in towns was much greater than in Holland and Denmark, which were practically free trade countries. Moreover rural depopulation had been going on in our own country before Cobden and Bright were born. Even 150 years ago, or thereabouts, Goldsmith had deplored—

> "The land to hastening ills a prey
> Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

And, with unerring instinct he had put his finger on the cause. The cause was that, under our present competitive and owning system, increase of wealth, and of wealth-producing capacity, instead of leading to increased wages and a diffusion of the annuities of life as they should leave done, had resulted in heaping up wealth into too few hands, and this enabled the possessors of that wealth to get possession of the land, which they used as deer runs and pleasure grounds instead of allowing it to be used for maintaining a rural population and raising food for the people. Another cause was to be found in the ordinary development of social life. People were no longer content with the ordinary essentials or simple things of life. The working man for instance was no longer content with his porridge or his brose every day in the week and to don his marriage coat wherein to go to Church as long as he lived. He wanted to know something about books and things which only the town could give. The problem they had to solve was partly economic, partly social, and partly human. Members of the Opposition talked about a tax of 10 per cent. on imported food, but the net result of that would be to lower the margin of cultivation in this country and increase rents. Those who were putting this proposal forward knew what it meant. It might mean an increase in the rural population, but it would only place more people at the beck and call of the landlords.

This Bill was certainly a good deal more hopeful, and the Labour Party were going to give it their support on the whole, while thinking it was open to certain objections, which they would probably raise in Committee. Fixity of tenure, the fundamental idea of the Bill, was a good one. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin had said that he did not see how it would improve things or make the tenant a better farmer. He (Mr. Barnes) could not, however, see how an arrangement which placed the tenant at the mercy of the landlord was going to result in the greatest productivity of the farm. He would give a case which had come under his notice since the introduction of this Bill. When making inquiries into the question of small holdings he came across an old man nearing sixty years of age who had a short lease of a farm of about eighty-seven acres. He had four years of his lease to run, but was it likely that he was going to work that farm to the best advantage of the community for the remaining four years of his lease when there was a prospect at the end of his lease of his landlord coming down upon him for an increased rent? He thought, however, that the limitation of £50 annual value was a weak point in the measure; there should be some elasticity in that respect. It seemed to him that the man of small means would be likely to suffer under the Bill. The main principle of the Bill was to apply to farms of such a size as could be worked by a man and his family. It seemed to him that the limit ought to vary according to varying circumstances, and he would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that an Amendment of that character and giving discretionary powers to the Land Court should be inserted in the Bill. He now came to the financial aspects of the Bill, and said that the Bill was more than fair to the landlords, whose estates would be improved by monies of the State, whose gross rents would be turned into net rents. The landlords were opposing the Bill because they did not know a good thing when they saw it. He believed, not in bribing the landlords, but in the old policy of ransom put forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham in his palmy days. He wanted to direct attention to the method in which the money was to be spent. So far as he understood £35,000 was to be spent for the purposes of the Congested Board Act of 1897, and the remaining £65,000 of the £100,000 annually voted for the purpose of the Bill was to be applied under the Consolidated Act. Sections 5 and 6 of the Congested Board Act gave power to the Board to set up peasant proprietors, and already 230 of these had been set up. He objected for his own part to the setting up of peasant proprietorships. He did not believe in peasant proprietorship. He did not believe in private landlordism at all, and, therefore, he did not believe in any legislation which, by multiplying the number of private landlords, was going to make it more difficult for the State at some time or another to resume possession of what he could not help regarding as its own. His mind went back only a fortnight ago to the Holborn Restaurant meeting and to the Drury Lane Theatre demonstration held later, when the principle was put forward that the State once having acquired possession of land should never let it go. He hoped that the Government would give effect to that principle. As to who was going to be the landlord under this Bill he really did not know. He had heard the speech of the Solicitor-General for Scotland about the joint ownership in contradistinction to divided ownership, and yet he could not understand it. It seemed to him that the Bill set up a sort of trinity, three in one and one in three, the State finding the money, the landholder or tenant finding the labour, and the landlord carrying off the "swag." The landholder or tenant, at all events, got the benefit of fixity of tenure and fair rent as the hon. and learned Gentleman had explained, and that, so far as it went, was good, but he thought that the landholder or tenant got a little more and something to which he was not entitled. Under Section 7 of the Bill public moneys were to be given at the discretion of the Commissioners—given, not lent—to the small holder who was set up under the provisions of this measure, and *pro tanto* that man was also made landlord as he understood. If he was wrong in his interpretation perhaps the Secretary for Scotland would explain the matter. He objected to this, first of all on the ground that they were going to differentiate treatment as between that man and another man. Let them take the case of a trader in a village who failed in his business.

He drifted into the ranks of the unemployed in a town. What did the State do for him? So far as he knew they sent him off to Canada under the Unemployed Workmen Act. But the treatment meted out to the tenant by giving him money was altogether different. He suggested that that was more than fair to the small holder. He objected in the second place to the setting up of more landlords, or part landlords. That was why he objected to public money being used in that way. He believed the Bill only touched the fringe of the question, because after all it would not enable the small man in Scotland to get a footing upon the land in any considerable number. When he said the small man, he meant grieves and superior ploughmen. They were told that the Bill was going to do something in the way of improving the chances of those already on the land. It would improve the chances in life of the man who was able to stock a farm. It took, however, about £10 per acre to stock a farm and there was not one man in a hundred in Scotland who was now hungering for land, and who wanted to make himself a little more independent, who would be able to get the advantage of the Bill, simply because he had not the money to stock a farm. Why not face the problem as a whole, and set up those small holders as tenants of the State in some shape or form, and so put them on their mettle? He thought a far better result would be achieved in that way. The Secretary for Scotland, in introducing the Bill, deprecated this because the State was a bad bargainer. The right hon. Gentleman stated that the State was open to political pressure. Well, there might be political pressure, but the State, after all, was a better bargainer than a poor man under pressure of poverty, who was competing for the tenancy or ownership of a farm in competition with other people whom he had never seen. Only recently when he was in Scotland he inquired how the rents of small holdings were fixed. One man after another told him the same tale. When they wanted to get into farms they had to bid for the farms, and they did not know whom they were bidding against. When they were called upon ultimately to enter into occupation, they never knew how many had been competing for a farm, although they had understood that there had been a large number. Under these circumstances rents were far too high, as experience had proved. The hon. Member for Durham spoke, he supposed, from the point of view of the landlord when he objected to Land Courts on the ground that they would reduce rents. Had not experience proved in Scotland that under the operation of the Crofters Act rents had been reduced 25 to 30 per cent., and that there was reason for the Land Court making the reductions? There had been the same experience wherever judicial rents had been tried. Under the operation of the ordinary law of supply and demand rents had been fixed too high by the landlords. It seemed to him that they would have to come, sooner or later, to State ownership, and in conjunction with the acquirement of land by the State they would also have to set up some form of land banks whereby small men should be enabled to stock their farms and become tenants of the State. He had stated these views somewhat crudely. This was a matter which the Labour Party had not yet given great attention to. They were going to support the Government on this Bill, reserving to themselves the right to do what they could to amend it in Committee. They trusted that it would go through, and that it would result in the fixing of a much larger number of people on the soil in Scotland than had hitherto got a living there, and that it might to some extent enable the House to gain experience as to how they could deal with the subject in England. It might be said that what he had suggested was too large a scheme. Well, the evil was large, and it called for large and even heroic remedies. The time would come, whether under this Government or not, when the credit of the State would have to be used to fix people upon the soil in much larger numbers than this Bill promised to.

CAPTAIN WARING (Banffshire) said that, in venturing to criticise the Bill, he was actuated by no hostile spirit, his only desire being to voice the opinions of the constituents whom he had the honour to represent. They would welcome the Bill, even should it pass in its present form, although, having regard to the well-known opinions of the Secretary for Scotland and the Lord Advocate, they had hoped for something more than a re-draft of the Act of 1886—something more final, more drastic, and more complete in the nature of land reform. Before he became connected with his constituency the Liberal Association of the County of Banff—which included a large number of well-known and able agriculturists, many of whom were small holders of the crofting class, and possessed a knowledge of the land question as extensive and full as their knowledge of farming—meeting in August last, passed a resolution to the following effect—

> "That while welcoming the Government measure of 1906 (which is practically similar to the measure now before the House) and cordially supporting the object and general principles of the Bill, they would suggest that the Government provide facilities whereby tenants may become occupying owners of their holdings, while the Government retains the superiority of the land."

He was in hearty agreement with that resolution, expressing, as it did, a desire for land purchase in the place of the present proposal of compulsory leases, and he had discovered that his constituents were unanimous in that desire. He must admit that he listened with astonishment to the statement of the learned Solicitor-General for Scotland that the desire to become owners of the soil was alien to the genius of the Scottish race. He agreed that a complete scheme of land purchase for Scotland must be a large measure, and must of necessity entail a great expenditure, even when the land was valued at its fair and proper price and not at any fancy sum, or with the addition of any mysterious bonus to bribe individuals to enter into a patriotic and genuine scheme for the improvement of the agricultural industry of the country. He was also aware that he belonged in that House to a section renowned for its unswerving loyalty to the Government, and there was one thing that even his brief and limited experience of politics had taught him, namely, that it was often necessary to frame one's demands in inverse proportion to the extent of one's loyalty. Therefore he did not suggest a complete scheme of purchase at the present juncture. It had been said that the value of the land could not be accurately ascertained until a sufficient period of time had elapsed to permit of fair rents having been fixed. He thought that if it was possible to fix a fair rent it was also possible to fix a fair value, and that at the present time a gradual system of purchase might be instituted which would not entail a very great annual expenditure, and would be the means eventually of peopling Scotland with a community of peasant proprietors looking to one superior only, and that superior the State. If, then, the Government could see their way to giving greater elasticity to the Bill and to providing facilities for a gradual development of that description, they would produce a measure more in accord with the great bulk of opinion in Scotland, than the Bill as it at present stood. Turning to another point—he desired, if possible, to emphasise the position of the agricultural labourer under the Bill. Everyone knew what excellent labour was provided by the croft, and how greatly the loss of that labour had been deplored by the larger farmers in districts where crofts have disappeared. But in the south-east of Scotland crofters were practically unknown, and not only in the south-east, but in all parts of Scotland, there existed representatives of that excellent and worthy, though rapidly dwindling, class—the agricultural labourer. Under this Bill—and he regretted that in this he differed from his hon. friend the Member for East Aberdeen, though he could agree with the hon. Member for the Blackfriars Division of Glasgow—there was nothing, or practically nothing, done for that class, since to benefit under the Bill a man must be able to satisfy the Commissioners that he had the experience and the capital necessary to equip a small holding. In his judgment it was almost imperative to provide land for the farm labourer, if he was to be kept on the land at all. Only a few acres would be necessary, but the possession of these would enable him to gain experience and put aside money, which would eventually place him into a position to enter into a bigger holding, possibly a pair-horse farm. He would quote an instance that had come under his notice: A farm labourer occupied a holding of twelve acres, which was wrought for him by the farmer in consideration of the former receiving from the latter £32 in wages instead of £36. The man occupied that twelve-acre holding for nine years, at the end of which period, and as a direct result of his occupation of the holding, he was enabled to take a thirty-acre croft at a rental of £15. He might

Captain Waring.

say in passing that when the individual moved into his thirty-acre croft, the labourer who had been driving the second pair on this same farm took up with alacrity the twelve-acre croft which had been vacated by his colleague. That he believed to be a most desirable arrangement, and he thought that some clause might be introduced whereby a farm labourer could be placed in a position to obtain both the experience and the funds necessary under this Bill for him to enter into a larger holding. Then with regard to Clause 16 of the Bill, the resumption of holdings by the landlord. He was aware that hard cases made bad laws, but he was going to put forward a case which was a hard one, and he thought entitled to some consideration from the right hon. Gentleman. Clause 16, or rather Clause 2 of the Crofters Act of 1886, permitted the landlord to resume the holding at the expiration of the lease for certain very laudable purposes. But it did not provide for the landlord resuming possession in order to himself, with his family, occupy the dwelling house and farm the lands. In Banffshire a very large estate, consisting almost exclusively of small holdings within the meaning of this Bill, was offered for sale at a very proper and reasonable price. The existing tenants however, in most cases, refused to purchase though given the refusal, and the holdings were purchased by others of the crofting class, who became rent receivers for the time being, intending as the leases fell out to occupy the holdings themselves. The majority of these leases would terminate in five to seven years time. But should this Bill become law the existing tenants could apply for fixity of tenure, and these other crofters belonging to the same class, the very class the Bill was intended to benefit—individuals worthy of all praise, for they were solvent since they purchased, thrifty since they were solvent, and eminently desirable as occupiers of the land, since they had actually purchased their holdings out and out without the assistance of the Treasury or of an Act of Parliament—these crofters would never be able to occupy the holdings which they intended to make their homes. He thought that that case was worthy of attention and that Clause 16 should include a provision that the desire to occupy and farm a holding should be deemed a reasonable ground for resumption by the owner. He could only say that in the parts of Scotland with which he had been and was now connected, land reform would be thankfully received, and they welcomed this Bill in spite of its limitations, because it inculcated the principle that when any man desired land for the purpose of cultivation, he could obtain it and would no longer meet with that obstruction of insane prejudice which had been the ruin of the agricultural industry of this country.

*SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said he wished to congratulate the Government upon the approval which the Bill had received from the hon. Member for Glasgow and the hon. Member for Banffshire, those twin Socialistic supporters. He also congratulated the Government upon the logical result of the arguments of the hon. Members for Glasgow and East Aberdeenshire, that the proposals in the Bill would lead to, not only dual ownership, at the suggestion of which the Solicitor-General was very indignant, but a trinity of ownership—the Land Court, the owner who was to be left with a remnant of his interest, and the occupying tenant. There were many Members on the Ministerial side of the House as distinctly opposed to Socialism as they on the Opposition side were. For instance, the hon. Member for Midlothian had, he thought, gone on a campaign against Socialism. Were these hon. Members prepared to see Socialistic views carried as far as was proposed by the hon. Member for Glasgow and the hon. Member for Banffshire? He held no brief for the landowners of the country. No one was less connected with land than he was, and no one related to him had ever been the owner of twelve acres of land. His interest in the land question was that only of a student of the economical development of the country, and, in that aspect, these proposals were of the greatest importance. Two hundred years ago, at the time of the Union, the population of Scotland was only one million, and it was almost entirely rural. In his own time he had seen the marvellous transference of the population from the country to the town; but at the time of the Union not more than 100,000 people lived in towns of over a population of 4,000. But what was the condition of that overflowing rural population? Was it really nourished in any decent conditions by the land? He recalled some statistics given by no less sapient a statistican than the Baillie Nicol Jarvis, whose words were put in his mouth by a brain which understood Scotland, and interpreted by an imagination which could realise, as few could, the actual facts. The Baillie's calculation was that the population of the Highlands was 230,000, of whom he said by no human possibility could more than half earn an honest livelihood, and the rest he asserted without fear of contradiction were little else than thieves–picturesque and romantic thieves, no doubt—but all the same living on plunder. But he rather respected them, because they were not ashamed of their profession, and although occasionally they took cattle which was not their own, they did not describe it as thieving, but called themselves "gentlemen drovers." That proved that during the 18th century, in regard to which they had comparatively few statistics, they had a very populous country, and an immense leeway to make up in regard to town population. The vast increase of manufactures, by which after all Scotland had to gain her wealth, because her country was not one which could have brought her to be a leader among agricultural countries, was concomitant of the necessary advance in urban population. This state of things went on till 1800, when he calculated that the rural population was something like 1,200,000, against an urban population of something like 400,000. In the middle of the last century it had grown until the population was something like 3,000,000, an increase of 60 per cent. over that of the first part of the last century, and that was accompanied by a growth of population in the eight large towns to 750,000. As the result of the development of the commercial undertakings of the country, the population in these large towns had now grown to 1,700,000 out of a total of 4,500,000. In that Scotland had not differed from the other countries of the world, because this sort of change had been going on everywhere. The increased population in towns, therefore, was not due to any wickedness on the part of the landlords, or to any niggardliness on their part. In the latter part of the last century the movement was due to causes which were absolutely patent to everybody who cared to take note of them. The hon. Member for Glasgow looked askance upon the new efforts at colonisation which had been made, but he was prepared to say that a large part of the youth of Scotland, especially the most ambitious youth of Scotland, would always find a home in our Colonies greatly to the advantage of the Colonies, their own country, and themselves. That was inevitable when one considered the advances which mankind had made together with the enormous amount of labour-saving apparatus now employed in agriculture. These causes not only naturally but necessarily led to the vast shifting of the population between 1851 and 1901. The shifting of the labour population in Scotland, however, had not been so large in recent years as it had been in years gone by. No doubt some counties had suffered a small diminution of population, but the diminution in those counties where it had most taken place was in total numbers during the last fifty, sixty, or seventy years something under 100,000. That was not a very great diminution when one was dealing with a population of 4,500,000, and it had not been a universal diminution or one which had prevented the rural population of Scotland as a whole increasing during that period. What was the proposal of the Government to deal with this change? The Opposition were as anxious as the Government to stimulate residence in the country, to relieve the pressure upon great towns, and to do something to stem that physical deterioration which necessarily came from the conditions of town life. He did not believe, however, that these results would follow from the establishment under the Bill of a few holdings of which no one would be the owner, and in which each partner would feel himself fettered by restrictions. The restrictions would only lead to friction and recourse to the Land Courts. That was not the way in which the peasantry of Scotland had grown up, and it would not give them a new peasantry now. It was not the way in which new relations between landlord and tenant would have to be set up in country districts, and it would not tend to the establishment of that form of Socialism which all regarded as distinct from the Socialism which rested upon abstract political ideas—that form of Socialism under which the community was knit together by ties of mutual interest and a desire to help each other. The Bill would destroy alike the influence of the tiller of the soil and the influence of the landlord. If the influence of the latter were injured it would mean that the good work he had done, which even hon. Members opposite acknowledged, would cease, and in the case of the tenant the Bill would mean that he would lose the first instinct of mankind, which was to have a sense of self-respect, increasing when he could call his home his own, and when he knew that what he had spent on it would remain his property. The Bill would create a set of occupiers who were to be held to the soil under Land Courts by means of payments, and the landlord would have no more interest in the land than the money lender or the mortgagee. It was to that position that the Government would reduce the landlords of Scotland, and although they all agreed that they should hold to the soil as many as the soil could maintain and should attract people back from the large towns, the Bill touched the mere fringe of the question and would destroy far more than it created by undermining the interest of the proprietors of the soil. The Solicitor-General had said that the landlord was deprived of no rights whatever except the fixing of the rent; that he still retained the inestimable privilege of raising money on his land. But it was not now possible to raise money on the security of the land so easily as before. These proposals had not only reduced the power but the responsibiliy of landlords in cases where a new tenancy might be set up. They undermined the whole of that which was the landlord's property quite as much as a mill was the property of a manufacturer. Not only would these proposals do that, but they would introduce absolute insecurity. The landlord would never know whether, or when, any of his larger tenants might have their holdings cut up. How could these men carry on in any sense of security the farming of the larger holdings when they knew they were subject at any moment to have their land divided into miserable pieces? He believed the Government would have done better and done more for the rural population of Scotland if they had by some means or other improved the housing and sanitary conditions of the festering masses which were herded together in the midst of the towns. What was proposed by this measure was at best a small and ineffectual remedy for an evil of vast extent. Did the Government suppose that by allowing a few rents to be fixed on a few holdings they would relieve the pressure of the towns? The emptiness of the country was no doubt partly caused by vast aggregations in towns. If they wished to palliate the evils of town life they must do so by attacking those evils at their centre, and not by starting an artificial system of land tenure in the rural districts of Scotland. Let them consider for a moment what the climate and conditions of Scotland were. Out of 19,000,000 acres of land in Scotland only 4,500,000 were under cultivation, or something like one acre per head of the total population, or two acres per head of the agricultural population of the country. Did they really think that by a mere "Mrs. Partington's" mop of this sort they would stem the tide of colonisation, and check the energy and the zeal which carried the young men of Scotland out to the Colonies, to the veldt, or to the virgin prairies to make two blades of grass grow where one had grown before? It was the smallest, the most insignificant, the most ridiculous attempt that had ever been made to provide for the great and growing youth of Scotland, whose ambition was not to be circumscribed by the boundaries of a small holding measured out to them by a Land Court under fixed conditions. Did the Government think that was a good substitute for all that they were doing all over the world? There was another aspect of the question. They had been taunted with being tarred with the brush of Protection. He did not know, and therefore was not prepared to say, whether there were not on both sides of politics people tarred with that brush. His withers were unwrung, because he made his position perfectly clear at the time of his election; but he asked who would make most proselytes for Protection—the Unionist Party, or the Government that established a doubtful system of small holdings, that planted a few persons of its own choosing on small holdings, contrary to the conditions of the market, fixing what rent they had to pay by an arbitrary Commissioner, making them strive to earn a livelihood out of those small holdings under conditions which necessarily could not pay in competition with the more productive larger holdings, and without that great capital with which alone the vicissitudes of agriculture could be met in a climate which was not fitted to compete with the more genial climate of other countries? The climate of Scotland might develope scientific horticulturists, but it was not one which would permit of large profits in agriculture. Were not the Government likely, if their proposals were carried out, to make out of every one of the new tenants put upon the land not only hardened but bigoted Protectionists, because only out of Protection of the severest kind could they ever gain their livelihood? He believed that this measure could only produce an infinitesimal amount of good in relieving the congestion in the great cities, and for that problematical advantage they were sacrificing the rights, interests, and duties of the landlord. He quite agreed with one hon. Member who spoke, that they were fully justified in expropriating by compulsory purchase a landlord who was an evil to the country, but everybody would admit that this Bill propounded a scheme that would shake the foundations of our social system.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

WORTHING GAS BILL (BY ORDER).

As amended, considered.

MR. RIDSDALE (Brighton), in moving "That the schedule be omitted," said it was with considerable diffidence that he took the course which he was now taking. This Bill was a Bill for a private company, incorporated under Act of Parliament, and which had acquired statutory powers to supply gas to the corporation of Worthing. The Bill had already been before a Committee of the House upstairs, and had passed that Committee; and he was quite aware that if a private Member took the unusual course of opposing any part of that Bill in the House, it was necessary that he should make out a very good case. He asked the House to believe that it was with a full sense of the responsibility of the course he was taking, that he made the Motion which stood in his name. This company had now its works in the group of houses which constituted the town of Worthing itself. When it first obtained its Bill and erected its works, those works were in a comparatively unoccupied district. He found that as long ago as 1893 it required fresh ground in order to complete its works, though it had no room upon its present site. It then purchased a field called the Home Field, and kept it for some time without using it, because in the year 1893 Worthing suffered from a severe epidemic, and there was not that increased demand for gas which the company had been led to expect would arise. Finally, when the demand began as Worthing grew, the company visited the field and found it to be, in their opinion, unsuitable for the erection of gas works. They found that they could obtain a piece of land very much better suited to their purpose—a piece of open ground upon which their main works then stood. The corporation of Worthing at that time assented to their works being extended over that piece of ground, and it was only the strongest opposition of some householders and dwellers in the neighbourhood which prevented them from holding that piece of land. The opposition was so great that it became necessary for the Board of Trade to cause a local inquiry to be held. As a result of that inquiry a Report adverse to the scheme was made by Sir Alfred Bateman. The company consequently looked round for other ground to be obtained, and finding a site in the neighbouring village of Goring, acquired the property in the schedule of this Bill. As soon as the inhabitants of Goring became aware that the gas company desired to leave Worthing and to set up gas works among them, they began to be greatly perturbed and to do all that was in their power to object. The old parish council of Goring objected to the company. It was on the point of fresh election at the time this matter was pressing, and the election was fought mainly on the question whether the gas works of the Worthing Company should be allowed to be proceeded with in Goring parish or not. The supporters were entirely defeated, and the new parish council petitioned the House or the Committee upstairs against the Bill. Not only did the parish council of Goring petition against the Bill, but the neighbouring parish of Durrington also petitioned against it. And not only these two parish councils, but the East Preston District Council petitioned also, after a large meeting in which fourteen members out of a total number of eighteen voted, and the motion was carried unanimously. He could not conceive that it was to the interest of good local government that the views of local bodies should be overridden by the House. The House went to considerable trouble, he believed rightly, to set up parish and district councils in order that they might be able to manage their own affairs. Here was a case, if ever there was one, in which the council was able to form an opinion as to whether a proposal was to their detriment or to their advantage. They formed the opinion that the coming of these works would be detrimental, to the parish of Goring, and they asked and he asked in their name, that the House should not impose upon them the nuisance which really and truly belonged to their neighbours. Did that neighbour itself wish to impose that nuisance upon them? This, as he had stated, was a private company; its shareholders were all over the country, and no doubt many of them were in Worthing; none the less, it was a private company. It was not the corporation of Worthing. So far from the corporation of Worthing being anxious that the company should place these gasworks in Goring, which was the only avenue of expansion for the town of Worthing westward, the mayor and ten councillors up to the present date had signed a petition against the Bill. Were there any precedents for this course? To impose a nuisance upon a local body against its will was not a thing that ought to be done lightly. There must have been cases in the past in which attempts, at any rate, had been made. He had looked up those attempts, and he awaited some supporter of the Bill being able to put his finger on a single precedent for imposing gasworks on an unwilling community. There was a time when the Gas Corporation of Birmingham supplied gas to a neighbouring district of Erdington. As they supplied the gas to that district they said it would not be unreasonable to ask to be allowed to put gasworks there, but it was objected to. The Corporation of Tunbridge Wells desired to take their gasworks out of Tunbridge Wells and put them in a country district. That was refused also, and as far as he could ascertain there was absolutely no precedent for the action proposed in the Bill. It was on these grounds that he was asking that the schedule should not be passed. Gasworks were admitted to be detrimental to the growth of a town. There was a very marked case within his own knowledge in the town of Brighton, where gasworks were erected in Kemp Town, and that stopped the growth of the town in that direction for about fifty years. At one time Kemp Town was the fashionable end of Brighton, but once those gasworks were put there, building stopped at the boundary, but never went beyond. It was true that when they ceased to manufacture gas there, houses were built beyond the boundary, and there were about half a dozen houses dotted about beyond the boundary. They might possibly think that it was only the landowners who objected to this. It was admitted that the presence of gasworks did depreciate the land near which they were placed, and it was computed that the coming of these gasworks into Goring would depreciate the value of the land by about 50 per cent. He was not concerned in that House to defend the position of landlords. But he did not want to see values unnecessarily destroyed, and if they were going to have the taxation of ground values it was highly desirable in the interests of everybody that these values should be maintained in order that they might be taxed. The village of Goring lay about 400 yards from the place where the gasworks were to be erected. The villagers were as strongly against the coming of the gasworks as the landlords themselves. Out of 118 voters 110 had signed a petition objecting to the proposal. The reason would be apparent to the House when he stated that Goring was a pretty little village at the seaside, and the majority of the inhabitants made a large portion of their yearly earnings from letting lodgings. They did this in the summer season to such people of the towns as required fresh air. So much was this the case that the clergyman of Goring felt it incumbent upon him to come up and give evidence before the Committee as to the damage which would be done to the village by the schedule of this Bill; and he stated in his evidence that he received every summer applications from some twenty or thirty people asking him whether he would be kind enough to procure lodgings for them. As far as he could see, the position of a clergyman in such matters seemed to be rather like that of a Member of Parliament, who was asked to do all kinds of different things which would not occur to most people. He thought he had made out a case as regarded the facts, and it would take some answering. As far as he could ascertain the arguments on the other side, they exactly amounted to this—that there was no other available site for the gas company to go to, and that it was common both to the objectors and to the supporters of the Bill that a further supply of gas was urgently needed for the supply of Worthing. When he stated to them that the corporation of Worthing included within its boundaries no less than seven square miles of territory, whereas its population was only 23,000, it would be apparent to them that the site difficulty could not be an insuperable one. Sir Alfred Bateman had reported that the Gas Company acted unwisely in 1894, and that it did not appear to him that there were any insuperable difficulties in obtaining a site for the extension near the railway. He hoped in a matter so vital to the inhabitants of Goring the company would not be allowed to ride rough-shod over them. He begged to move that the schedule be omitted.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) seconded the Amendment. He thought when the House had heard the whole of the arguments for and against this Amendment, they would agree that there were very strong reasons for refusing to allow this measure to pass in its present form. What was the main reason why they objected to the Bill? It was because it imposed upon a village a scheme to which the inhabitants almost unanimously objected. As his hon. friend had stated in his speech, he believed there existed no precedent of any kind in which the House had sanctioned

such a scheme to which the whole of the people in the area affected who had anything at stake took exception. The town of Worthing was by no means unanimous in favour of the scheme, if indeed the majority of the inhabitants were in favour of it at all. As a matter of fact, so far as they could judge, the town of Worthing was opposed to the scheme. Both the local papers published in the town of Worthing, one of which was a Conservative and the other a Liberal paper, had printed leading articles against the schedule of the Bill. Not only that, but a public petition had been got up in the town of Worthing against the Bill, which had been signed by the mayor and ten of the councillors and a large number of other influential residents in the town. He submitted it as a very strong point indeed that even in the town of Worthing, which was supposed to benefit by the scheme, the inhabitants were by no means unanimous in favour of the scheme. He thought that upon this Amendment one should ask oneself two questions. Firstly, could the company obtain land within the Borough of Worthing? As his hon. friend had stated, the area within the Borough of Worthing was seven square miles, and there was not by any means a population to the square mile which was at all excessive. As his knowledge of Worthing was limited, for he had only been there on a few occasions, he did not put forward his local knowledge of the town and ask the House to accept it in any way. Anybody who has ever been to Worthing would agree that there were a great many sites in the town which could be utilised for the purpose. In the evidence given before the Committee the promoters of the Bill alleged that it was not possible to find a suitable site within the area of the town. That view was supported by an expert brought forward by the promoters of the Bill, but the opponents of the measure also brought forward an expert who said exactly the opposite. Anyone who had been connected with private Bill legislation knew that on Private Bill Committees that was a thing which very often took place. But he had very much stronger evidence to bring forward than that of the two experts, although he did not want to make any reflections upon their opinion. Sir Alfred Bateman, in his Report to the Board of Trade upon another application of the

Worthing Gas Company for an extension of their present works, gave as his reason for refusing that application that he believed it was possible to find a suitable site for the extension required near the railway which passed through Worthing. That was not long ago, and Worthing had not devoloped so rapidly as to make it any more difficult to obtain sites for these works. That Report brought out the extremely unbusinesslike method in which the Worthing Gas Company had conducted that part of the business which dealt with their application for increased powers. Some time ago, they acquired a certain site, which they afterwards discovered was not suitable for the erection of gas works, and Sir Alfred Bateman commented upon this action of the company in his Report to the Board of Trade. He believed that the company, if they were prepared to pay a proper price for the land, could obtain perfectly suitable land for the purpose within the Borough of Worthing. Even if the company were unable to obtain land within the Borough of Worthing, the House should ask itself whether the land could not be obtained anywhere else where the presence of the works would not be so resented by the inhabitants as it was in the village of Goring. He had some little local knowledge, and, although he did not know the town of Worthing well, he did know the land round about, and, in his opinion, on the east side of the town there were several sites which it would be possible for the company to acquire, where what he might call the nuisance works of the town of Worthing—the sewage, the electrical, and other works—had all been erected, and were now being conducted. As was clearly brought out in the evidence before the Committee, the east end of the town was not regarded as the part most likely to increase for residential purposes, or the part which during the last two or three years had increased most rapidly, very likely owing to the fact that these works, which were more or less of a nuisance to the neighbourhood, were already there. The people of Goring objected to the scheme, because it would destroy one of the principal charms of the village, and would very largely injure the position which the cottager and farmer now had in being able to offer lodgings in a small and quiet village removed from the hustle of town. They also alleged, as he thought with very great reason, that the erection of these gas works would seriously injure the future residential value of the village, because at the present moment the town was growing in that direction, although there was practically no building going on. There was no doubt that in a very few years the village would become part of Worthing, and all around, and especially in the neighbourhood where it was proposed to erect these works, could be found very valuable residential sites. The value of land for agricultural and horticultural purposes just where it was proposed to erect these gas works was very great. As far as his own position went in supporting the Amendment, he would certainly be more or less directed, as to whether or not he went to a division, by what the Chairman of Committees said on the Bill. He thought, however, that they were justified in calling the attention of the House to the state of affairs which would be brought about if the Bill was passed, and to the very serious precedent which the Committee were making by allowing a company to erect works and force upon a village a scheme to which the whole inhabitants, the local councillors, and everybody connected with the place were strongly opposed. He trusted the House would not allow the Bill to pass in its present form.

Amendment proposed—

In page 25, to leave out the Schedule.—(*Mr. Ridsdale.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*Mr. WILES (Islington, S.) said he held no brief on behalf of the Worthing Gas Company; in fact, he regretted that the Worthing Corporation did not make gas themselves, but as they did not it was the desire of the company to supply gas for their town, and as he understood that this Bill was one which the corporation of Worthing generally supported he had his name put on the back of it. He had no interest whatever in the gas company, nor had his correspondent who was chairman of the Electric Lighting Committee for the Corporation of Worthing. Generally the feeling in Worthing was quite contrary to the opinion expressed by the hon. Member for the Horsham Division of Sussex. He believed there was a vast majority of the people strongly in favour of the Bill, because the gas works were now too small to make the supply of gas required, owing to the great increase in the population of Worthing. With reference to the site, it had been said that other sites were available in Worthing. He knew Worthing fairly well, and he felt sure that it was impossible to get any suitable site within the area, except in the eastern part of Worthing. The hon. Member for Brighton said that the proper place to put the gas works was near the generating station and dust destructor. This company a few years ago purchased a site in that locality, and they found—and he believed other available land was in the same position—there was a large running seam of sand, twelve feet deep, in which it was impossible for them to lay a foundation.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: May I interrupt the hon. Gentleman and say that that is disputed both by the opponents of this Bill and by others. The contention is not upheld by Sir Alfred Bateman's Report.

*MR. WILES said he believed the Committee who went carefully into the details of the Bill were perfectly satisfied with the evidence they had that this was practically the only site available for the Worthing Gas Company. It had been said that the Bill should not be passed because a handful of people living in the charming village of Goring were opposed to it. The evidence of the opposition came from the rector or vicar, and the landlords who generally objected to gas works near their property. When the vicar was asked a question by the Committee with reference to the benefit of the proposed new works in increasing the population of Goring he said—

> "We do not want to increase a certain class of people."

Then, when he was asked what kind of people he would like to come, he replied that they should like people who were able to live in houses of £70 to £80, and and who would bring their necessary servants with them. They were told that 110 out of 118 cottagers had expressed an opinion against the gas works being placed on the proposed site. He supposed they had been convinced by the landlords. It would be easy for landlords and their friends in any locality to get an expression of opinion on the question whether they would be in favour of gas works there or not. It had been argued that the Corporation were against the Bill. He was advised by his correspondent, who was a member of the corporation, that only ten out of thirty-two Members signed the petition against the Bill, and, therefore he thought it was hardly fair to say that public opinion and the opinion of Worthing Corporation, were against the Bill. [AN HON. MEMBER: The Mayor is.] The Mayor might be, but he did not always represent the corporation, or the opinion of the town. For the House to reject a Bill after it had been three days before a Select Committee would be a very unusual course, and he hoped that on account of some Members who appeared to have some personal interest——

MR. RIDSDALE: I appeal to you, Mr. Speaker. I have no interest whatever in this Bill or in Worthing, or anywhere else. My interest is the public interest.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: I must also ask the hon. Member to withdraw that statement. In saying that I have a personal interest in this matter he has made a serious accusation.

*MR. WILES said he meant to make no personal accusation at all. When he said personal interest he meant a knowledge of the locality. He knew that both of the hon. Gentlemen had an interest in the district. He hoped that the House would not reject the Bill simply because of a little opposition from persons concerned in the way he had indicated.

*SIR HENRY KIMBER (Wandsworth) said he was sorry to find himself in disagreement with two hon. Members who were good friends of his own. It seemed to him that they had given no reason why the House should depart from the good old practice of approving of the decisions of Committees when the propriety of those decisions had not been impugned on some good principle. The appeal was generally urged, if it was heard at all, on the evidence given before the Committee. He asked the House how much of the evidence given before the Committee had been read to the House on this occasion? The two hon. Members who had moved and seconded the rejection of the Bill—for that would be the effect of cutting out the schedule—had said that the ground of their opposition to the Bill was not put forward by the friends on whose behalf they spoke. He did not impugn their motives at all. He was sure that the mover and seconder were actuated by the purest of motives. But the party who put them in motion had been heard before the Committee. The Committee sat for five days and took evidence, not hearsay evidence, as the House were doing now, but direct personal evidence on oath. The House devolved on the Committee the duty of hearing and examining witnesses and arriving at conclusions. No suggestion had been made that that Committee did not behave properly, that they had exceeded their duty, or that they had wrested justice in any manner. The House was asked on the *ipse dixit* of two hon. Members, who could not possibly have had the advantages afforded to the Committee who heard evidence for five days, to reverse the decision of the Committee. And what was the ground? The sole question was whether the gas company should be at liberty to obtain sufficient ground to fulfil duties imposed on them by Parliament. It was a question of site. It was admitted on both sides that they must have extra accommodation. They must get it somewhere. A gas company having no compulsory powers could not force the expropriation of ground for gas works. They had to make an agreement with somebody willing to sell. The investigations made two years ago by the Board of Trade through its very competent officer, Sir Alfred Bateman, showed that the site then proposed was not suitable and they advised its rejection. The gas company took twelve months to consider the matter, and consulted professional and expert men whose competency was not denied. They were produced before the Committee, and they gave evidence on oath. The only place they could find after twelve months exploration of the neighbourhood was the particular site scheduled in the Bill. They brought it before a Committee of the House, and the Board of Trade, having had an opportunity of examining the proposal, did not oppose it. The Committee had the advantage of knowing what the Board of Trade thought, and they passed the Bill. The *dictum* of Sir Alfred Bateman, which had been quoted, that he did not believe that the difficulty of obtaining a site near the railwav was insuperable, had been met by this Bill, for the site was near the railway, and it was the only one, it must be presumed, which the gas company could obtain. As to its being in the village of Goring, it was nothing of the kind. It was a quarter of a mile off at least. It was admitted by the mover to be 400 yards off. He believed it was a great deal more from the village. Even the hon. Member admitted that the company must have further accommodation for fulfilling its Parliamentary duties to the public in the locality. The hon. Member had said that the House had to ask itself the question whether there was no other site available. Was it to be supposed that the Committee did not go into that question? As a matter of fact it certainly was inquired into by the Committee. The arguments of the opponents of the Bill was that there were other sites which could be obtained, but they were not successful in getting the members of the Committee to accept that view. The Committee decided unanimously in favour of this particular site, and gave the necessary powers. This was one of the forms of devolution by which the House worked through its Committees. It had been exercised for very many years with great advantage to the House, relieving it of the necessity of going into discussions like the present. He asked the House seriously to say that this Motion, if brought before a court of law in the form of an appeal, would be called a sham appeal, for the evidence had not been laid before the House. Although the Bill was five days before the Committee, not a scrap of evidence had been adduced to show why their decision should be reversed. It would be a travesty of anything that could be called justice to set aside the decision, and he asked the House to reject the Motion.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley) said that as Chairman of the Committee he might be permitted to add a few words to what had been so well said by the last two speakers. It might seem discourteous on his part if he did not say a few words on behalf of the the Committee that considered the Bill. He did not think he would care to object to everything that was said by the hon. Member for Brighton and the noble Lord the Member for the Horsham Division. It had been asked what was the opinion of the whole corporation. The whole corporation passed a resolution on the subject the effect of which he could not at the moment say, but he thought it was not to oppose the Bill. At least it left them to infer that the corporation would not oppose the Bill. The only other new point he heard from the hon. Member was that land would be largely depreciated in value. He thought the hon. Member had a very exaggerated view of the enormities of the Bill. He admitted that the strength of the case of his hon. friend was very great, and that it was pressed on their notice by able counsel and able witnesses. But he would state one or two of the reasons which weighed with the Committee in coming to their decision. This was the third attempt of the gas company to obtain a larger site; it had been generally admitted that something must be done, and that there was no room for extension of the works on the present site. Reference had been made to the inquiry made by the Board of Trade into the application of the gas company for leave to enlarge their premises, and to the objection taken by the people whose houses were close to the gas works. But the gas works had been there for seventy years, and the people had come to the neighbourhood with the full knowledge that they were there. His hon. friend urged that when they came to a new area with such works as gas works, all the objections that might be made against them should be taken into account. He did not think that the Committee could have asked the gas company to go further away for a site for their new works. The gas company ought not to be regarded as a nuisance, since it supplied a public demand. The public wanted gas, and more gas. The noble Lord had said that there were other available sites, but he could not find them, and every opportunity was given by the Committee to the witnesses to suggest a suitable site. Mr. Stevensen was asked if there was not an available site, and he put his finger on the map and said, "that site is perfectly suitable from every point of view." But when he was asked if he had inspected it, it turned out that he had only seen it from a railway train.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR said that that might be the case, but did the hon. Gentleman allege that there was no other site that the company could obtain within seven miles? What was the objection to this particular site?

MR. ALFRED HUTTON said that it was not for him to go over all the evidence again. His recollection was that the site was open to the objection of having beneath it running sand. The Committee considered very carefully all the objections of the opponents of the Bill, but were forced to the conclusion that they ought not to reject it.

MR. NIELD (Middlesex, Ealing) thought the evidence was conclusive that the Bill should be read a third time. Some people seemed to object to gas works as much as to a small-pox hospital, but he thought that of two evils the lesser should be chosen. After all, if Worthing desired to have a further supply of gas, it ought to have it. The Committee upstairs considered the Bill for five days; they had the assistance of counsel in examining and cross-examining the witnesses, and they came to the conclusion that there was no alternative but to pass the Bill. The House ought to be very slow after that long investigation to reverse the decision at which the Committee arrived.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. EMMOTT) thought the House pretty well realised the facts of the situation. The Worthing Gas Company was prevented from extending its works in the neighbourhood of its present site after an inquiry by the Board of Trade. The company tried for other sites, and that selected was the only one which the Committee (a very strong one, presided over by the hon. Member for Morley), decided was the best alternative site available to the gas company. A good deal had been said about the nuisance of gas works, but the Committee had put in a clause to provide for the planting of trees round the works. It was found that only four houses were within 300 yards of the works. In the Report of the last day's proceedings there was a statement of the Chairman's which read as follows—

> "The real question is the alternative site which I have been hammering at all along."

He read that to show the great care with which the Committee considered the question of the alternative site, and he would remind the House that it was no part of the duty of a Committee to consider the question of alternative sites. Their real duty was to deal with the business before them, which was the proposal contained in the Bill. They were, therefore, undertaking a work of supererogation in dealing with the question of alternative sites. Might he say one word about the result which would be entailed by upsetting the decision of this Committee? It would stop the increase of works and stop the increased supply of gas, which he understood was badly wanted. But it would have a very much more serious effect than that. It would have a very serious and undesirable effect upon members of the Committee who sat for five days and considered the matter with great care. It would also have a very serious effect upon other Members of the House sitting on Private Bill Committees if they were encouraged, as they would be encouraged by an adverse decision in this matter, rather to reject a Bill than to pass one which contained any novel or unusual solution of the question submitted to them. He thought the Private Bill Committee work of the House was a matter of which the House had always been proud, and might reasonably still be very proud, and it would be a very, very serious matter to interfere with it by upsetting a decision come to after a long and careful inquiry. He made no complaint of the matter being brought before the House. The decision was an unusual one, but it was unusual because the case was unusual. With regard to the question of precedents, to which the House rightly and naturally attached great importance, he did not know that there was a precedent on all fours with this case. All the other cases which had been mentioned as being similar were cases in which the Bills had been rejected in Committee. There was absolutely no precedent for a Bill which had been passed by the Committee, like this Bill, being rejected by the House on a purely Committee point. Therefore he thought the precedents might be used not only by those who opposed the Bill but by those who were seeking to support the finding of the Committee. Under these circumstances he asked the House to think twice and even thrice before it supported an Amendment of this character which would inevitably destroy a Bill over which a great deal of time had been spent and to which the Committee had given a great deal of attention.

LORD EDMUND TALBOT (Sussex, Chichester) begged to say, in self defence, that he had no interest direct or indirect in this question. He was only interested in it in his capacity as Member for a neighbouring division to that in which it was proposed to erect these works. He had the warmest sympathy with the hon. Member for Brighton, and so far as he had heard no one in the debate had yet met the challenge which he threw out in regard to precedents. The Chairman of Ways and Means had admitted that there was no precedent so far as he knew for the actual course taken by this Committee, but he went on to say, as he understood him, that there would be no precedent for the House going against the Committee in regard to a Bill of this character. He was not going now to take up the time of the House by entering into a discussion of the points which had already been raised, but what he suggested to the House was that if they adopted the decision that the Committee had come to they were laying down, as he understood, for the first time a precedent, and that precedent was nothing more than this, that a private company was to have the right against the wish of the district concerned to "dump" its works down in a locality which was not to benefit from the existence of those works. If they did that they would be taking a strong step and one which ought not to be taken without further consideration. He should certainly support the Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said he thoroughly agreed with the remarks which had been made by the

Chairman of Ways and Means. The House had set up a system of Private Bill Committees under which this Committee sat for many days and listened to the evidence and to the arguments of counsel, and if they were to attempt to revise the decisions which had been come to after all that labour, he thought they might as well at once do away with Private Bill Committees and attempt to settle all such matters in the House itself. He knew nothing about the merits of the points in question, but he submitted that it would be a bad day for the House if on small or shallow grounds they were to reject the decision come to by a Private Bill Committee. He understood, and if it was the fact it would influence his vote, that if the inhabitants of the neighbourhood could prove that the gas company's undertaking as it was established constituted a nuisance they had a legal remedy. Under these circumstances, a Committee of the House having sat for five days, heard the evidence, and decided the matter, he should certainly vote for the Bill and against the Amendment.

MR. RIDSDALE said that in view of the remarks of the Chairman of Ways and Means he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment, hoping that further evidence might be produced by the opposers elsewhere which would result in a different decision.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill to be read the third time.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Postponed Proceeding on Amendment to Question [29th April], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words, 'this House welcomes State action to promote small holdings; but, supporting the principle of responsible ownership in land, it believes that the Government policy should be based on purchase, and deprecates the extension of an extreme form of divided ownership to districts beyond those crofter areas where the occupier provides equipment.'"—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)—resumed.

Sir F. Banbury.

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty), in supporting the Bill, said he wished to criticise some of the remarks of the hon. Member for Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities. The hon. Gentleman had gone a very long way back, but in the course of his speech about the development of towns and the depopulation of the Highland districts he had omitted to allude to the brutal evictions which had taken place prior to the passing of the Crofters Act, and which to a large extent had caused the decrease of people in those districts. Men were taken by hundreds and sent off to Nova Scotia like sheep. Let him and others who wish to make themselves acquainted with the character of the evictions about the middle of the last century read Mackenzie's *Highland Clearances.* The hon. Member did not tell them the details of the scheme by which he desired to stimulate interest in country life, and did not see how that was to be done except under some system of purchase and not by a Land Court such as was set up under the Bill. Surely anyone who wished to stimulate the development of the country would prefer the system proposed by the Bill rather than to leave matters under the control of the landlord. The hon. Gentleman had referred to the bond of union between the people and their landlords, but he had traced the history of men whose forefathers had been for two or three hundred years on the croft and to whom the usual forty days notice was given by the landlord or factor to clear out. The difficulty of borrowing money on land had been alluded to, and he had no doubt there would be difficulty at this moment. The hon. Gentleman had referred to the Bill as if the proposal was something absolutely new, whereas for twenty years they had had experience of the working of the Crofters' Act. Yet the hon. Member talked about this socialistic method of bringing about a change and said its result would be disastrous. Under the Crofter's Commission they had arrived at a better state of things than prevailed before in regard to the position of the crofter. The right hon. Member for South Dublin had referred to the present definition of ownership, and mentioned a number of societies, among others the Highland Society, which were opposed to the Bill. That was purely a landlord society. A man like himself would not be allowed to belong to it. Yet that was the society that the right hon. Gentleman instanced as being opposed to the Bill. So far as the Amendment was concerned he did not believe there were more than two Members, the mover and the seconder, on the Liberal side of the House who would support it. He was surprised to hear the right hon. Gentleman say that the landlord should have the right to make the best use he could of his land. The landlord had tried that a good many years before the Crofters Act came into force. Under the benign landlord rule, evictions were carried out wholesale, tenants were rack-rented to such an extent that they were unable to pay the rent, and the Government of the Party to which the right hon. Gentleman belonged sent down gun-boats and Marines to the Highlands to shoot down the people who could not pay impossible rents and rates. For many years he had appealed to the Party opposite to do something for the Highland people, without success, and now the right hon. Gentleman told the House that the landlord should have the right to make the best use he could of the land, which meant evicting the tenants and turning the holdings into deer forests. Why should such care be taken of the welfare of the landlord ? A man whose property consisted of stocks and shares had not this care taken of his interests. Bills which seriously affected them were brought into the House and passed, but there was this everlasting anxiety for the interests of the landlord, that he should be protected and cared for. Thus the proposal of the Conservative Party that the landlords should be bought out. If that was desirable they might be bought out at a later stage. That was a matter which could at any time be considered. It had been said that the Land Court would fail. He did not believe it. It had not failed in the case of the Crofters Commission which had been running for twenty-one years. It was further said that if it failed the landlord would be impoverished. On the contrary, if any of these holdings were vacated the landlord would be left a good deal better off than before. The land would be better tilled and cared for than before the man was settled on the holding under this Bill. When he went to the Highlands he marvelled at the number of new houses, not built by the landlords, but by the people themselves. Was not the landlord better off in that respect ? In the Island of Lewis alone there had been nearly £50,000 worth of improvements made entirely through the energy and thrift of the people themselves. The right hon. Gentleman said "trust the landlords." The people in the Highlands for a good many years had weighed the landlords in the balance, and found them wanting. The right hon. Gentleman said "trust the good landlords." They might trust the good landlords; it was the bad ones that could not be trusted; the men who had blasted and blighted so many homes in the Highlands of Scotland. He would not trust any of them, and he was glad to see the Government were moving, if not entirely in the way he would like, at least in the right direction. He had pointed out that fixity of tenure would encourage men to make their homes in every way better. Let the lowlands of Scotland have the benefit of the Act, but it should not be given to them at the expense of the Highlands. It was because Members of the Government did not understand the Highland question that he wished them to go to the Highlands and see the condition of things for themselves. [OPPOSITION cheers.] It was all very well for hon. Members opposite to cheer, but their Party was infinitely worse in that respect. He foresaw that the Highlands under this Bill were going to lose in order that the lowlands might benefit. He wished for the Bill, but there should be special clauses for the Highlands separate and apart from those for the lowlands. The Government had, however, climbed down at the bidding of the landlords. Last year's Bill was more generous, and he would like to know why the Government this year had departed from the policy they adopted last year. He was sorry that they had not stuck to their guns. The hon. Gentleman, the Solicitor-General for Scotland referring to the financial provisions of the Bill said, "Ye maun creep before ye gang." He quite agreed, but they should see that they had the strength of limb with which to creep. Financially there was no strength in the Bill even to creep. What could be done with £65,000 for the whole of Scotland? He hoped that the Secretary for Scotland would put his foot down and keep it down until the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stumped up sufficient money for Scotland's needs. They could always get money for England. The other day the Secretary for War in the jauntiest, lightest, and sprightliest manner said he would give £150,000 more for the Volunteers. Why did not the Secretary for Scotland do better than he did with the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The hon. Members for Leith Burghs had pleaded for afforestation? Nobody wanted to prevent the landlords from planting trees on their land, but the landlords wanted the Government to provide the money. There was nothing to prevent landlords planting trees if they wanted them, but they could not expect the British tax-payer to do everything. As to the *status* of farm servants, he held that they would have a better *status* if they had their own holdings—like the crofters, who prior to the Crofters Act were often timid and afraid when they saw the factor approaching; now they were fearless and independent of both landlord and factor, so long as they paid the rent fixed by the Land Court. In like manner farm servants when in possession of small holdings would improve their *status*, till they, too, would be independent. The hon. Member had said they should wait for the English Bill. No; they had waited long enough, indeed far too long; and they wanted this Bill to go into Committee without delay. The factors were now at work carrying out evictions before this Bill passed into law. Objection was also taken to the Central Authority, and it was suggested that these matters should be settled by the local authorities. But his experience was that the people were too poor to leave their homes for three or four days in order to attend county council meetings; moreover they could not afford the time. He preferred the Central Authority. He looked at the work of the Crofters Commission, and he was satisfied that if the Land Court did its work as well it would be a perfect god-send to the small landholder. If the right men were chosen for the Land Court the scheme would work all right; if they got the wrong men, then the whole business would be an utter failure. Let them get the right men, good, straightforward, honest, and experienced men, who would hold the balance evenly between landlord and tenant, and then he believed the Land Court would be in no way exotic, as his hon. friend had said. He was glad that compulsory powers were to be taken, and that a Land Court would be established which, like the Crofters Commissioners, would hold the balance fairly between landlord and tenant. A good many Amendments to the Bill would have to be introduced and carried before it could meet the requirements of the Highlands. What had Scotland to do with an English Bill? England was the predominant partner, and she could take care of herself. Some attempt should be made to deal with the case of persons living around boroughs. Then it was asked, why restrict the rental to £50? The answer was that to introduce into the Bill large farmers who had rents over £50 and some up to £1,000 and £2,000 a year, would break the back of the Bill. This measure did not set up dual ownership; the landlord would retain all his rights; the tenant would have to pay his rent, or he would be cleared out. The landlord would not be despoiled of his rent, and under the Bill he would get it with greater regularity. What more could he want? The landlord wanted territorial power; he wanted to look down from the height of his castle and say—"These thousands of people are mine as well as the broad acres." But all that was of the long ago. The day for serfdom had gone by. He had been too long in the House to trust any Government. When the Bill was introduced he did not join in the discussion, but preferred to wait till he had seen, read, and inwardly digested it, and he must say that now he had seen it he was somewhat disappointed. There had been too much bubbling over with gratitude before any mercies had been granted. He preferred to wait, and show his gratitude when he saw what he had to be grateful for. He had expected a measure of a more democratic character from the Government now in power. He was sorry the Government had not stuck to their guns. He was disappointed with their proposals. Indifference was shown to the conditions in the Highlands, and allowance was not made for the fact that the people brought the land into cultivation from the bog, drained and fenced it, and erected the buildings, whereas in the lowlands all this was done by the landlords. The Lord-Advocate went to Inverness last autumn, where he made a brilliant speech on the Small Holders Bill. In that speech he said that a claim, backed by the highest skilled advice, had steadily proceeded from the crofting districts, and that claim ought not, with a powerful Liberal Government in power, to be allowed any longer to go unheeded. The claim he alluded to was that the benefits of the Crofters Act should be extended forthwith to the leaseholders. In 1899 the Lord-Advocate said—

> "What is the situation? You have men holding land side by side under the same climatic and other conditions, under the same landlord, with the same hardships, the same set of circumstances, where the improvements on the holding have been similarly made by the tenant. One of these tenants has conferred upon him fair rent, fixity of tenure, and other securities; but the other tenant, the leaseholder, has none of these advantages."

What had the leaseholders done? Why had the Government run away from their former convictions? Every Liberal elector who recalled what had been said in past years by the present Lord-Advocate, would be painfully surprised to find that the benefits of the Bill were not to be extended to leaseholders until the expiration of their present leases. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman and the Secretary for Scotland would consider seriously the advisability of going back to the conditions provided under the Bill of last year, and not show the white feather with such a magnificent majority behind them. The leaseholders should get the benefit of the Act directly it became law. He noticed that the new landholders had to be persons with sufficient ability to carry on the holding. What was meant by ability in this case? Why did they not define it? He thought it should be more clearly expressed, there being at present too much ambiguity. Were only those who were preferred by the landlord to get holdings? He did not expect a democratic Government to give that power of selection. Had not the landlords "bossed" long enough? He knew many cases where people had suffered on account of their political opinions. They should prevent any landlord saying that he would not have a certain man simply because he had expressed opinions of which he did not approve. He did not expect a democratic Government to truckle to the landlords in the way proposed. Clause 7 provided that, except by agreement a new holder should not be registered—

> "(*a*) In respect of any land being or forming part of a farm not exceeding 150 acres occupied by a person who has no interest in any other farm; or (*b*) in respect of any land being or forming part of a farm occupied subject to a lease which was in force at Whitsunday, nineteen hundred and six, so long as the lease remains in force."

Why not make land which was under lease at once available for new holdings and the enlargement of holdings? If hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury bench were cognisant of the state of matters in the Hebrides and the western parts of the mainland, they would never insert such clauses as the foregoing. A man who had a £50 holding was a prince among men who had holdings rented at £4 or £5 a year. He did not complain of that provision so far as the south of Scotland was concerned, but they could not afford to apply it in the Hebrides. It would shut out a large number of people in the surrounding districts who wanted land. The limit should not be more than £30 in congested areas. He would like to know what power was to be given to acquire land now devoted to deer forests and grazing. The Bill was extremely vague on that point. So far as he could see it would be competent for the Land Court to say that these lands were not available. There was no provision in the Bill which would prevent the extension of deer forests. Every highlander expected the Government to stop the extension of deer forests. Would they give power to the Land Court to prevent such extension? He should like to know what was going to happen in the case of a deer forest with a farm attached to it under lease. If a landlord let a deer forest with a farm attached to it on lease, apparently the Land Court could not under this Bill touch an acre of the deer forest. There were now 3,000,000 acres of land used as deer forests in the Highland crofting counties alone, and it was high time that this extension of deer forests should stop. If not stopped by a Liberal Government, it would never be stopped by a Tory Government. He hoped the Government would see that deer forests were broken up to provide land for the people. In some parts of the Highlands the glebe lands were really large farms. That was unfair to people in congested areas. These glebe lands were excluded from the scope of the Bill. He did not object to a minister having a fair share of land, but if he wanted to be a farmer let him go and be a farmer. If he remained a minister let him attend to the spiritual welfare of the people. He was glad powers were given under the Bill to erect dwelling houses in the congested districts. But how were they they to do that with £35,000? In the Island of Lewis there were hundreds of the most insanitary houses on the face of the earth. That was denied by the local authorities in the districts, but it was a fact, and he invited hon. Gentlemen to go and see the houses for themselves, or read the report of Dr. Dittmar, the medical inspector for the Local Government Board for Scotland. Under the Bill eight Commissioners would be appointed, and why were the salaries of the five Land Court Commissioners stated, and nothing fixed in regard to the salaries of the Agricultural Commissioners? Were they to receive £500 or £1,000 a year? Then out of the eight Gentlemen, only one was required to understand Gaelic. There ought to be at least two Gaelic-speaking Commissioners. Was the Chairman of the Land Court to be a lawyer, or some fossil brought in from some other Department? What was wanted was a man like Sheriff Brand, who was Chairman of the Crofters Commission for twenty years. Every Liberal elector who recalled what had been said in past years by the present Lord-Advocate would be painfully surprised to find that the benefits of the Bill were not to be extended to leaseholders until the expiration of their leases. The Secretary for Scotland had assured him that provision would be made in the Bill for the fencing of deer forests, so that crofters, crops might be protected from deer, but nothing had been done. [Laughter.] It was all very well for the Solicitor-General for Scotland to laugh; but this was a very serious matter for the poor crofter. He wanted to know why the promises many times made had not been fulfilled in drafting the Bill. When right hon. and hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench sat on the other side of the House they agreed with him, and said they were going to do wonders when they got into power. He would do the best he could in Committee to improve the Bill. Most of the highland Members knew that what he proposed to do was right. He was an enthusiastic supporter of the Government, and he wanted them to do what was right, and not to jib. Unfortunately, they did not know the Hebrides and the general needs of the Highlands. It was not pleasant to talk against one's own Party, but he was going to vote for the Bill, and he hoped that right hon. Gentlemen would not forget their promises and pledges.

*MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said that like several Members on the other side of the House who preceded him the hon. Member who had just sat down had delivered his soul to the effect that he did not like the Bill, but like a good sound Liberal intended to vote for it. He thought it was rather a remarkable fact that of all the hon. Members who had spoken from the benches opposite there was not a single one who advocated the whole of the Bill. One of the principal points in the speeches had been a desire to arrest depopulation in rural districts, and if this Bill had been a well-considered scheme, calculated to retain upon the soil a larger population, it would have found a wide measure of support from the Unionist Party. A Return had been issued a few days ago relating to small holdings in Scotland. It would be found from that Return that 70 per cent. of the farms in Scotland were under £50, rental and that out of 89,000 occupiers 62,000 were under this figure of rental. Was there any reason in face of these facts why the Prime Minister should say that the claim for small holdings had been met by a "blank denial"? On the contrary, the landlords had recognised their duty, and had been able to meet the necessities of the case by providing small holdings. The Government now proposed to apply the Crofters Acts to the whole of Scotland. The Government appeared to go back to the principle in force in ancient days, and to provide the same remedy for all diseases. Bleeding was the universal remedy in old days for all diseases whether a man was suffering from a plethora of blood or from anæmia; and it seemed to him that the Government said to themselves whenever they saw a landlord, "Let us bleed him." That was the sole policy they had to bring forward for the welfare of the agricultural classes, regardless of the essential difference that existed between the Highlands and the Lowlands in regard to the tenure of land. In the Highlands the crofters were liable to be dispossessed at forty days notice and had no security of tenure, and to apply the same kind of remedial legislation to other parts of Scotland where the leasehold system gave absolute security during the currency of the lease and the Agricultural Holdings Act gave compensation for unexhausted improvements at the expiry of the lease, was absurd. The Secretary for Scotland commenced his speech by saying that there were two alternatives which might be adopted by the Government. One was the system of purchase, which was a perfectly fair one to be adopted by any Government, because then they would experiment at their own cost and their own risk. The right hon. Gentleman rejected that idea on the ground that it would be too costly. He said he preferred on the contrary the condition which he called fixity of tenure, which was a form, "more or less, of dual ownership." The right hon. Gentleman saw no "injustice in establishing such a system in Scotland where the landlords made all the improvements." The right hon. Gentleman said the landlord would have under the system proposed a better security for his rent. But was that the only tie between landlord and tenant? What about good feeling? Was the landlord to have no power of choosing between a good and a bad tenant? Was there no possibility that there might be a tenant whose character was such that it might not be desirable to associate him with an estate? Was that not a privilege which a fair and right-minded landlord was entitled to exercise? The landlord was acquainted with the circumstances of the district and the private character of every individual who might be an applicant for a tenancy. Yet the matter was to be decided by the Agricultural Commission, strangers to the locality and without that knowledge of the private character of applicants for tenancies which the landlord possessed, though it was of vital importance to the landlord that his tenants should be men of good character. When the Prime Minister was challenged to produce evidence of his statement that the demand for land had been met by a blank denial he referred to a Report of 1895. There was a Report, dated last year only, which put a very different complexion on the case, a Report of the Board of Agriculture on the decline of the agricultural population. If they took almost any county in Scotland they would find that the Report of the Board of Agriculture gave the reason for the decline of the population.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN said, that if the hon. Gentleman referred to him, he might say that he was referring to England much more than to Scotland, speaking, as he did, in London. But he was very much mistaken if the very Report mentioned by the hon. Gentleman did not amply bear out the statements he had made. He had not examined it himself very closely since this little controversy began, but he believed that it would bear out everything he had said.

*MR. COCHRANE said that, if time had allowed, he would have read the Report of the Commissioners. In the majority of cases the general tenor of the Report was contrary to the expression used by the Prime Minister that there was a "demand which was met by blank denial." On the contrary, the falling off in small holdings in Scotland was due to low prices, to the employment of labour-saving machinery, and to all those economic causes with which every hon. Member was familiar. These did not in any way bear out the views put forward by the right hon. Gentleman. As to the demand for small holdings, the returns showed that there was a great decline. In the debates last year the hon. Gentleman who represented the Board of Agriculture, and who was not now present, spoke of the hard-headed Scotsmen whose opinion carried so much weight with the Government. Well, these hard-headed Scotsmen had held another meeting of the Chamber of Agriculture in Edinburgh, in the last few days, and they had before them the Bill promoted by His Majesty's Government. That conference of the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture, which claimed to represent 18,000 of the tenant-farmers in Scotland, was presided over by the hon. Member for Argyllshire, so that at any rate that body could not be accused of being unduly Conservative, seeing that it was presided over by so good a Liberal. The conference gave a long consideration to the Bill, and passed a resolution to the effect that the conference disapproved of the Bill in respect of its not being calculated to attain its object, and that it would create a state of unsettlement between owners and tenants.

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

MR. AINSWORTH (Argyllshire) said that as the hon. Gentleman had referred to him personally he hoped that he might be allowed to explain. The Chamber was an entirely non-political body, and as he happened to be president for the year, he took the chair at the conference. The conference by its resolution expressed itself thoroughly in favour of small holdings, but only regretted that the machinery provided by the Bill did not, in their judgment, carry out its object.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Gentleman's explanation is exceeding the limits of a personal one.

*MR. COCHRANE said the last thing he would have suggested was that the Chamber of Agriculture was entirely associated with one Party, and the remarks of the hon. Member clearly went to prove that the Chamber was composed of both Parties; and, therefore, the resolution of that body had clearly its weight multiplied three-fold by the explanation of the hon. Member who presided. The right hon. Gentleman, the Lord Advocate, had found fault, in his speech on the First Reading of the Bill, with evictions; he desired that this Bill should be introduced in order to do away with what he called the "arbitrary power of eviction." He supposed that the right hon. Gentleman, when he came to speak, would give some instances of a general character, and not confined to individual instances, as to any wholesale evictions which had recently taken place.

And, it being Eleven of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

IRISH TOBACCO BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

Adjourned at six minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Tuesday, 30th April, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor aquainted the House that the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bill have been complied with: Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply. The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [H.L.]. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill [H.L.]. The King's consent signified; and Bill reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

Kendal Corporation Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee with Amendments.

London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market) Bill. Reported without Amendment, and committed to a Committee of the Whole House Tomorrow.

Falmouth Gas Bill; Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill; Basingstoke Gas Bill. Reported without Amendment.

Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [H.L.]; Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill; Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [H.L.]; United Methodist Church Bill [H.L.]. Reported, with Amendments.

Selsey Water and Gas Bill [H.L.], now Selsey Water Bill [H.L.]. Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Southend Water Bill [H.L.]. Read 3^{a} and passed, and sent to the Commons.

York (Micklegate) Strays Bill [H.L.]. Standing Order No. 92, considered (according to order), and dispensed with, with respect to a Petition of the Freeman of the City of York; leave given to present the said Petition.

London and North-Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill; North East London Railway Bill; Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill; South-Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill. Brought from the Commons, read 1^{a}, and referred to the Examiners.

Glasgow Corporation Bill [H.L.]; Renfrewshire Upper District (Eastwood and Mearns) Water Bill [H.L.]. Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Viscount Hutchinson (*E. Donoughmore*) be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Clinton; read, and agreed to.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1.) Bill [H.L.], (No. 41). A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Dorking Water, Freshwater Gas, New Tredegar Gas and Water, Skegness Gas, and Woking District Gas;

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill [H.L.], (No. 42). A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Herts and Essex Water, Mid-Kent and Twyford (Berks) Gas;

Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill [H.L.] (No. 43). A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to the rural district of Cork;

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3.) Bill [H.L.], (No. 44). A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Castleford, Egham, Formby, Grimsby (Extension), Liversedge, Maldens and Coombe, Mansfield (Extension to Mansfield Woodhouse), Paignton, Selby and Stoke-upon-Trent (Extension): And

Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill [H.L.], (No. 45). A Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, the Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1890, and the Electric Lighting (Scotland) Act, 1902, relating to the Burgh of Arbroath;

Were presented by the Lord Granard (*E. Granard*). Read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIAL CONFERENCE, 1907.

Précis of Proceedings of the Colonial Conference, 15th to 26th April, 1907.

LOAN FUND BOARD OF IRELAND.

Sixty-ninth Annual Report, 1906.

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACT, 1888.

Report by the Board of Trade in accordance with Section 24, Subsection (4) of the above Act, on the schedule of maximum tolls and charges to be made applicable to the New Junction Canal, authorised by the Aire and Calder and River Dun Navigations Junction Canal Act, 1891.

METROPOLITAN POLICE (ACCOUNTS).

Accounts showing the sums received and expended for the purposes of the Metropolitan Police and Police Pension Funds between the 1st April, 1906, and the 31st March, 1907.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

IRISH TOBACCO BILL.

Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and to be printed. (No. 46.)

DESTRUCTIVE INSECTS AND PESTS BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without Amendment, and re-committed to the Standing Committee.

MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATION BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH: My Lords, I have, in the first place, to express my regret that this Bill should have appeared several times on your Lordships' Notice Paper and have been put off from one day to another. It will be needless to explain the causes of these several delays. I only hope that none of your Lordships have suffered any inconvenience in consequence. The Bill itself is in its scheme a very narrow, I might almost say a small, Bill, although I believe it is fraught with considerable consequences.

The plan of the Bill is to enable the councils of municipalities in England and Wales and of boroughs in London to be elected, if so desired by the different municipalities and boroughs, according to the principle of proportional representation, so that the governing body of the municipality or borough should contain within itself representatives of the different elements in the life of the district in proportion to their respective strength. In that way the council would be truly representative of the citizens, not, representative of the majority only, not caricaturing the strength of the majority, but representing, according to the proportion of their strength, the different elements which make up the civic life of the community.

The Bill is a permissive Bill. According to processes which are well known and which are authorised by many previous Acts of Parliament, it enables a municipality or borough to make these changes if certain formalties are followed. Those formalities are, of course, matters of detail, and, if necessary, can be criticised in Committee. The only thing to be aimed at is that the change shall not be made without due consideration and without a decisive opinion in its favour, and these guarantees are, I think, secured by the machinery of the Bill. If it is thought that the machinery wants strengthening, any proposal to increase its strength can be considered.

I do not think it is necessary that I should defend the permissive character of this legislation, though I have heard it remarked, in quarters where I should have least expected such an observation, that the scheme of the Bill, if adopted at all, ought to be made universal. Our legislation in relation to civic administration, and all that appertains to that development of social reform which has been so marked a characteristic of our municipal life during the last generation, has almost always proceeded upon tentative lines. Some community has sought for powers for itself and obtained them, other municipalities have followed, and then an Act has been passed enabling all municipalities who desired to do so to follow on the same lines. In this way one branch after another of social reform has been pursued. Almost all the great bodies of legislation with reference to the policing and sanitation of our great boroughs has been thus accomplished; and much of educational work has been carried through in this way.

Every year sees new experiments promoted by municipalities which are very keen in the pursuit of their civic life. Sanction is obtained in one place, and the experiments get copied in other places, until at last Parliament, seeing their value, makes them universal. The older Members of your Lordships' House will remember that the system of county police became adopted in the way I have described, county police forces being at first permissive forces. Therefore, I do not think it is at all necessary to press the point that in this Bill we propose to enable a municipality which so desires it to adopt, instead of the present method of electing its council, the method contained in the Bill which aims at securing on the governing body of the town or city proportional representation of all the elements of life within that community.

I think I must say a word before proceeding further to explain that in submitting for your Lordships' approval this Bill dealing with local representation and the constitution of local governing bodies I do not in the least wish to put aside that greater idea, of which it may be known to some of your Lordships I have been for some time an advocate, of extending the same principle to our Parliamentary representation. It is not necessary to discuss that subject now, and I do not propose to diverge into it; but I may be permitted, perhaps, to say that twenty years' close observation of the course of public life in this country has more and more convinced me that if we wish to have in the future a Legislature which will represent the strength and moderation, as well as the movement of the community, in which there will be men of moral courage and independent character, men who cannot be brought to swear to the shibboleths of one or the other Party, but still remain valuable members of the nation—if we wish to have a Legislature in the future securing us these benefits, we shall have seriously to consider the adoption of some plan of proportional representation.

But I do not wish to embarrass the present subject by entering on that consideration. I propose now to submit to your Lordships only the application of this principle to the election of municipal councils, and in doing this I am following an example furnished in a remarkable illustration elsewhere. I am also acting upon grounds of reason which I think would recommend themselves to your Lordships. I have, as I have said, been persuaded by a close study of our own political history of the necessity of that larger change of which I have spoken The same conviction has been supported by watchful attention to the development of Parliamentary government in some of the continental states. In Belgium for some years past a complete system of proportional representation has been established in the election of the Chambers of its Legislature. The system has worked with extraordinary success in conducting the political life of Belgium through the many difficulties which beset a country divided as that country is between men of different religions, different races, different nationalities, men of the most advanced opinions socially, and men who are wedded even now to some of the traditions of feudal aristocracy. But in Belgium this great change was adopted four years after a similar change had taken place in the election of its communal councils, and I am therefore following the example of Belgium in submitting to you as a field in which the experiment may be tried a proposal to adopt proportional representation in the case of municipalities.

The example of Belgium, I may remark in passing, has had a most extraordinary influence apparently upon opinion in the neighbouring countries of Europe. In France there is at this moment under discussion before Committees of the Chamber of Deputies, two Bills, one for the adoption of proportional representation in the election of the Chamber itself and another for the adoption of proportional representation in the election of the councils of the communes of France. In Holland a Royal Commission, after studying the example of the neighbouring country, has recommended the adoption of proportional representation in the reconstitution of the Parliament of that country; and in Sweden at this moment there is under discussion a Bill, submitted by the Government of that country, for the reform and reconstitution both of the First and Second Chambers in accordance with the principle of proportional representation. So that out of the germ of municipal reform which was adopted in Belgium some ten years ago, there has been developed the larger plan in Belgium, and there is the prospect of its adoption in other countries in Europe.

Now, my Lords, what is it that I wish your Lordships to sanction, so far as sanction is involved in reading this Bill a second time and referring it, as I hope your Lordships will, to a Select Committee? Let me endeavour to direct your attention, first, to what I conceive to be the drawbacks of our present system of electing municipal councils, and the still greater drawbacks which attach to the present system of electing the borough councils in London, and, then to the scheme by which I hope and believe these evils can be removed without any danger of other evils taking their place. Your Lordships will be well aware that in the constitution of the town councils of our provincial municipalities the great majority of the boroughs are divided into wards. Each ward has three, or, it may be, six members on the town council, and one-third of those members is elected every year. If there are three members for the ward, one is elected every year, and if there are six members two are subject to annual election. That scheme was adopted when municipal corporations were formed some seventy years ago, with the idea of securing continuity of life within the councils of the several boroughs, of preventing them passing through those shocks of violent change which would be involved in a complete alteration of the *personnel* at any election, and also of preventing, if possible, the introduction of political parties and political combinations into the reformed municipal life. The first object has been secured, but the second object has certainly not been secured. Your Lordships are well aware that, in spite of the aims and desires of the reformers who established our municipal corporations in 1835, political motives very largely enter into the election of councillors and are sometimes predominant reasons for choosing one set of members instead of another.

A remarkable instance of the extreme length to which political action can be carried in directing the elections of municipalities was commented upon about thirty years ago, when one of our largest boroughs, containing from fifty to sixty members on its town council, returned a council consisting entirely of Liberals and Radicals. There was not a single Conservative amongst the whole body. I thought at the time, though this was made an occasion of glory by those who had succeeded in securing that result, that it was a matter rather to be regarded with shame, because it meant the ostracism from the civic life of that community of a large number of persons who by inheritance, by education, by family ties, by personal residence, were well qualified to take as they were desirous of taking their part in the government of their city.

That was, I admit, an instance of Party spirit carried to the extreme. But your Lordships are well aware that in too many of our boroughs the system of electing one-third of the members each year has not secured those borough councils from the intrusion of Party politics. Your Lordships know that every autumn, when these elections recur, there appears in the newspapers the next morning a summary of what has happened from the one end of the Kingdom to the other, and the Unionists are said to have gained so many seats in one place and the Radicals so many seats in another, and the majorities are calculated and the political position of the councils stated with the utmost exactness. As I said before, we have not saved our civic governing bodies from the intrusion of political elements which are foreign to their primary purpose, and which, if permitted to intrude as they have intruded with the strength which they have attained, are derogatory to the good action of such governing bodies. The machinery has secured a certain continuity, but on the other hand, it is purchased at a certain loss of advantage.

You are unable by the machinery of election to obtain at any time a decisive view of what may be the opinion of the community on any particular question which is then under discussion. It often happens that there is a considerable question, such as the taking over of waterworks, or of gasworks, or the entering upon some field of municipal activity, or the laying out of a public park, and such like matters, on which it is desirable to obtain the opinion of the whole community; but that opinion cannot be obtained by the machinery which is used in the election of municipal councils. Again, there is this drawback attached to the plan, that each borough has to undergo the annual worry of a municipal, and often a political, election. Parties are kept up in a state of unnatural activity and alertness, and every year there is a strict fight on political issues in the election of one-third of the members who have to take the place of the outgoing councillors.

These are admitted drawbacks in our present system, and it has been more than a question whether the continuity which we have secured is not dearly purchased at the price of these drawbacks, especially when we consider the extent to which political action has entered into the election of municipal councils. Accordingly, when county councils came to be established in 1888—and they were established, as your Lordships will remember, by reference to the Municipal Corporations Act and largely upon the scheme of municipal corporations—it was decided, after considerable discussion, that instead of annual elections by one-third the county councils should be elected every three years, and that counties, at all events, should be spared the worry and trouble of these annual elections. The present Bill does not deal at all with county councils, and I only refer to that fact as leading up to another.

As your Lordships know, in the original scheme of Lord (then Mr.) Ritchie's Bill, London was not provided with a county council at all. That council was introduced almost without discussion. The details of the scheme of London government were arranged in the Lobby, and the scheme was placed in the Bill without discussion, and by a most unfortunate circumstance there was applied to the government of London machinery which may be appropriate enough in the government of a county of mixed rural and civic elements, but which is quite inappropriate to the government of a county like London.

This leads up to the other question to which I was about to call your Lordships' attention. Following on that Bill there came the question of the unification of London, and in 1894 a Royal Commission was appointed to consider that question. I had the honour of being the Chairman of that Commission, and, with reference to the proposed calling into existence of supplementary London boroughs, we then considered the methods of election of councils in municipalities and in counties in order to determine what we should recommend should be the method employed in electing the councils of the new London boroughs about to be created. The Members of that Commission did not arrive at one conclusion on that point, and we rather prudently decided to draw the attention of the readers of our Report to the different methods which had been proposed, to point out the virtues and drawbacks of the scheme of municipal elections, and to point out what had recently been done in regard to county councils. Then we said we thought further experience would be necessary, probably in pursuance of what had been done in reference to county council elections, before any final decision could be come to as to the best method of electing the councils of the London boroughs.

In 1899 Her Majesty's then Government brought in a Bill transforming the vestries so as to create the new London boroughs, and, according to the scheme of that Bill, the members of those borough councils are elected in wards, but are not elected one-third every year, but *en bloc* every three years; and the consequence is that you have a power every third year of completely changing the members of the borough councils in London. The elections which have since taken place have shown that that power not only exists but has been exercised. There was in the last borough council elections in London the most remarkable illustration of the evil which was sought to be avoided in the Act of 1835—namely, the absolute want of continuity between successive councils in the dismissal *en bloc* of the members of one council and the installation of a new set of members. In the elections which took place last November three boroughs did not secure a single Progressive member—the boroughs of Fulham, Lewisham, and Wandsworth. On the other hand, the borough council of Bethnal Green has not a single Moderate member.

These are results which, I think, are in themselves greatly to be regretted in the interests of the boroughs concerned. In nine other boroughs the Progressives did not secure as many as six members; in one borough they secured one member only, in another two, in two or three boroughs three members, and so on. Chelsea is one of the boroughs where the Progressives secured three members, and perhaps I may be permitted to refer to Chelsea, as it is the borough in which I have the privilege to live, and with which, of course, I am more intimately acquainted. There three Progressive members were secured, but only by accident. The Moderate organisers did not rightly measure their strength, and did not put up candidates sufficient for all the vacancies in two of the wards. The consequence was that, though the result showed they had voting power enough entirely to exclude the three Progressive members who were returned, those members managed to get in because their seats were unopposed.

I do not think it requires much argument to show that the system is a bad system which enables a borough council to be completely overturned, which deprives it altogether of representatives derived from one or other political party, which produces a discontinuity of its life, which causes it to lose very valuable and tried members and makes the administration of civic affairs largely a matter, not for the control of the representatives of the inhabitants of the town or city, but of the permanent officials. I may repeat admissions which I have heard from one or two members of the victorious party. They have often regretted the consequences by which they have lost men who they knew worked well in the council in previous years, and they gladly would have kept them in had not the force of political passion been too strong. Their followers insisted on running candidates for every possible place, and the result was the exclusion from the council of tried men whose capacity and business powers, whose knowledge of affairs, and whose prudence, were recognised by many of their opponents.

What is the result of this system? I may refer to what I heard quite recently in connection with another matter, where there had been almost as great an upturn of the composition of the civic governing body. A gentleman who had survived a defeated minority was asked how he got on in his present position, and he said—

> "Oh, I get on pretty well. I am largely alone, but the other fellows who have come in do not know anything about the business, and the expert officials control them. I sit silent, and am well content."

The permanent officials are the people who get the control of the municipal bodies, if those bodies are organised in this fashion. I have tried to make out a case that under the ordinary municipal corporation's election you do not keep out of the contest the virus of political action, you fail to secure a means of consulting the community at large, and you expose the community to the worry of annual elections. On the other hand, by triennial elections, you avoid the worry of annual elections, it is true, and you are able to consult the community at large, but you produce such startling changes and such loss of continuity, that the consequences are perhaps worse than those which follow from the older system.

Is there no way of avoiding both these evils, and of securing representative bodies which shall be elected, not annually, but triennially, under a system which shall at the time of the election give a clear and unmistakable evidence of the opinions of the community and yet shall secure in the governing bodies then elected the presence of representatives of all parties, so that, while the majority of the community get the majority in the council chamber, all the different elements of life in the community get their due representation also? That is what I propose under the machinery of the Bill now before your Lordships. I omitted to observe that one reason for submitting a Bill dealing with municipal elections instead of Parliamentary elections is this, that in municipal elections we have got the constituencies necessary for the application of the system ready at hand. In Parliamentary elections we have not, and we should have to create them, or, at all events, to revive them.

In order to obtain proportional representation you must have a constituency returning at least three Members; it may be more, but there must be at least three. In the application, therefore, of the idea to our Parliamentary life it would be necessary to create multiple constituencies, and we could do so very easily by returning to those units from which we departed in 1884. In the municipalities this is not necessary. You now have, in boroughs, wards returning three or six members, one or two of whom respectively retire each year. If the election were made triennial you would then have three members, or six, as the case might be, elected every third year and no alteration would be required.

Now, is the application of this system difficult? Contemplate a ward returning three or six members. It would be understood beforehand by everybody that no party could secure the whole representation, and no party would therefore put out a list of candidates for every seat. For the three or six seats there would be a list of candidates probably not bigger than the present list. The list would be submitted to the voter, and the business of the voter, when he got into the polling booth, would be to take the paper with the list of candidates upon it, as at present, but instead of marking his cross opposite the names of those for whom he wished to vote, he would place the figure "1" opposite the name of the man most to his choice. He need do nothing further. I ask your Lordships, Is that a process too intricate to place before the ordinary elector? The elector could go on placing the figures "2" and "3" opposite the men next of his choice, but he need only mark the figure 1.

In this connection may I diverge for a moment to call your Lordships' attention to this remarkable fact, that in that nation which has most recently, for good or ill, been admitted into the family of civilised nations—that nation whose power, strength, tenacity, and thoroughness have astonished, and sometimes paralysed, the observer—Japan—they have adopted proportional representation in the election of their representative Chamber, and they have restricted the voters to the initial step of marking with the figure 1 one man, and one man only? They have not gone any further than that. Having taken some years to organise their Constitution, and having sent representatives to many parts of the world to discover what process would be best adapted to their requirements, they have adopted, in the comparatively simple form to which I have referred, the principle I am submitting to your Lordships.

It may be urged that this scheme is intricate, that it is complicated, that it is too abstract for adoption by work-a-day citizens of a work-a-day world. But I venture to think that what is done with advantage elsewhere ought not to be impossible of adoption here. The sole work imposed upon the voter is of such an elementary character, and of such simplicity that it is almost impossible to conceive of any one qualified to exercise the rights of citizenship who is not qualified to indicate the first man of his choice on a list of candidates. The most ordinary voter in the most backward constituency in the Empire would be capable of marking the paper in the way directed.

Then I come to the returning officer. The returning officer has, no doubt, a more difficult task to perform, and on paper his duties may seem intricate and even confused. But the work of returning officers has been undertaken and discharged under circumstances of the greatest difficulty, and yet with considerable ease. A noble friend of mine who sits opposite, who has joined with me in this cause for many years, will perhaps give your Lordships some of his experiences in connection with it; but I may say that we have held public meetings, attended by unprepared citizens called together by ordinary advertisement, and we have had elections conducted at those meetings. Persons have attended in hundreds and lists have been presented for the first time to persons thus collected, and votes have been taken. We have had the papers removed from the hall in which the meeting was held and one of us has gone into an adjacent committee room with improvised clerks to assist, and, whilst the others have held the audience by answering questions and entering into a discussion of what has been going on, the whole process of counting the votes has been gone through, and the result has been announced in a quarter of an hour with complete satisfaction.

We have had considerable experience in testing the possibilities in this matter. We had a very considerable experiment in the first week of last December, with the assistance of a certain number of newspapers throughout the country. We received no less than 12,000 voting papers to elect five Members out of a certain number of candidates. In the course of about four hours the gentleman acting as returning officer, with the assistance of clerks who had scarcely had any drill for the purpose, went through the whole process of counting the votes in the presence of many onlookers and produced the result to the satisfaction of everybody present. There is no difficulty whatever about it. We have gone through it over and over again, and although on paper the actual work of the returning officer may seem to present difficulties, that is not so in reality. I do not know whether all your Lordships remember the explanation of the rules of arithmetic. The reasoning and explanation of the process of arithmetic it is difficult to put into words. So it is with this matter, but the system is, nevertheless, one of great simplicity.

On the system of voting proposed the number of votes necessary to secure the return of one Member is approximately the result of a division of all the votes cast by the number of vacancies and is called the "quota." In order to prevent waste of votes provision is made for the transfer of votes in excess of the quota given to any one candidate, and of votes given to candidates whose supporters are less in number than the quota. Such votes are transferred to the candidates whom the voters indicate on their ballot papers as next in order of their preference.

In the earlier part of this very long speech, for which I apologise to your Lordships, I ventured to suggest that the Bill might be read a second time and be then referred to a Select Committee. I am confident that if your Lordships will consent to this course the practicability of the scheme may be demonstrated to the satisfaction of every Member whom your Lordships may choose to appoint to the Committee. I ask for nothing more. Conscious as I am of the conditions under which Parliamentary life is conducted I am quite well aware that, even if your Lordships pass this Bill through all its stages, it will be impossible to get it looked at elsewhere. Every avenue of business there is already encumbered. Therefore I resign nothing in suggesting that I should be perfectly content if your Lordships would read the Bill a second time and refer it to a Select Committee. I am confident that there would result united opinion in favour of the practicability of the plan, and I hope there would result also united opinion in favour of the utility of its adoption in municipal elections.

I will not go further and speak of Parliamentary elections, although I do not conceal that to me, at all events, this is the introduction to the adoption of the idea on a much larger scale. I look to the revivification, I might say the regeneration, of our political life by the new birth which is promised in this form of voting, which will secure, in full strength and full independence, the representation of all the best elements of our national life. But that is something not necessary to be considered here. This proposal for municipal action is entirely independent of further and larger adoption. This is a permissive measure which would naturally be adopted if local opinion were persuaded of the utility of its adoption. It could be tried; if it proved imperfect it could be dropped; but if, as I am convinced it would, it resulted in the satisfaction of those who tried it, their example would probably be copied by others and the system would be extended until it became generally recognised as the best form of securing adequate representation. For the moment I ask your Lordships most earnestly to give this Bill a Second Reading and then let it be referred to a Select Committee, from the ordeal of whose scrutiny I am convinced it will triumphantly emerge.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª.—(*Lord Courtney of Penwith.*)

*LORD AVEBURY: My Lords, as my noble friend who has just sat down did me the honour of referring to me, I rise to say a few words in support of this Bill. The Bill, no doubt, seems complicated. Perhaps my noble friend might have made his task easier if he had taken a simpler example. I confess I rather wish he had. But his object was to show that even a complex case would present no real difficulty.

Too much has surely been made of the presumed stupidity of electors. There are, however, much greater difficulties in life. After all, what has the elector to do? He has a list of candidates before him, and all he need do is to place the number "1" against the name of the man he wishes to vote for. This is even less than he has to do at present. He may, however, place a "2" against his second choice. It is really the simplest thing in the world. We had an illustrative election a short time ago, and over 12,000 people voted. There were only twenty spoilt papers, and on most of these the voting was correct, but some words were added, which were taken, perhaps too severely, as vitiating the votes. Moreover, of the ten persons who perhaps really made a mistake, most would know better another time. There is absolutely no reason to suppose that there would be more spoilt papers than under the present system.

The second argument is that the supporters of proportional representation are making no progress. This argument is as untenable as the first. Even in this country we are steadily gaining ground. Abroad, the progress has been more marked. So far as Parliaments are concerned, proportional representation is in operation in Denmark, Switzerland, Finland, Belgium, and elsewhere. In municipal and other elections it has made even more progress. In the Canton of Ticino, whether by accident or design, the constituencies were so arranged that, election after election, the minority of the voters secured a majority of the seats. The patience of that majority being at length exhausted, in 1890 they made a revolution, and blood was shed, but the Federal Government intervened, and after consultation proportional representation was introduced, greatly owing, I believe, to the influence of M. Naville. It worked so well, and gave so much satisfaction, that it was gradually adopted by several other cantons, beginning with Neufchatel and Geneva, Soleure, Zug, the Half Canton of Basle, and several municipalities.

In 1895 proportional representation was adopted in Belgium for certain municipal elections. The change gave general satisfaction, and M. Braun, the Burgomaster of Ghent, speaking in May, 1899, described its results in the following terms—

> "During the four years that proportional representation has been applied to the communal elections of Ghent, every one has been able to appreciate the happy effects of the reform. Everybody recognises that, far from being endangered, the material prosperity of the city has increased, and that the ameliorating and pacifying effects of the altered electoral method have even exceeded the expectations and hopes of its advocates."

The present representative of Belgium in this country, his Excellency the Ambassador, has authorised me to say that as regards Parliamentary elections also everybody in Belgium is satisfied with the way the system has worked. In Germany, in 1901, permission was given to elect the members of the associated committees of employers and workmen in accordance with the principles of proportional representation. Sixteen towns, including Frankfort-on-Maine, Munich, Carlsruhe, Fribourg, and Mannheim, have availed themselves of the privilege, and the results have been most satisfactory. In February, 1906, the Labour Party of Victoria conducted an election on these lines for the purpose of enabling its 10,000 members to take part in the choice of the Party's candidates for the Federal Senate. The chief Labour organisation of Canada, the Trades and Labour Congress, has, since 1903, made use of the same proportional method in its annual elections, and its official platform contains the following plank—

> "14. Proportional representation, with grouped constituencies, and abolition of municipal wards."

The Toronto District Labour Council has also employed the single transferable vote in all its elections for about ten years, and this system of voting is finding favour with other Labour organisations, both in Canada and the United States.

The arguments for a change are by no means merely academical. They are serious and practical. Look at the last London County Council elections. In the last London County Council the Progressives had more seats than they were entitled to according to the number of their supporters. This enabled them to carry various proposals which would have fallen through if London had been fairly represented. Now, it is just the other way. A swing of the pendulum, which, measured in votes, would transform a majority of twelve into a minority of seventeen, has had the effect of changing a majority of forty-nine into a minority of forty-one, and it is the more violent displacement which forms the basis of comment in the Press and of action in the Council. I am, of course, myself glad of the change, but it has drawbacks which the proposals of this Bill would obviate.

Such great changes are themselves an evil. Moreover, many Progressives are useful and valuable members of a council. The Bill would ensure the election of most of the best and most useful men on both sides. Violent fluctuations are in themselves a great evil. This Bill would secure greater continuity; it would raise the level of municipal institutions and by securing the seats of the best men on both sides it would render it more easy to obtain and to keep the best possible representatives.

It is sometimes said that proportional representation gives more than they ought to have to minorities. That is entirely a mistake, and I am sure it is not the object we have in view. We do not wish to give the minority more power than they ought to have, but it is perfectly obvious that, under the present system, the minority are sometimes squeezed out altogether, and that at other times they have a great deal more power than they are entitled to. In these circumstances, believing that this system would be a very great improvement on the existing one, and that it is perfectly practicable, I venture to hope that your Lordships will adopt the very modest suggestion of my noble friend and give the Bill a Second Reading.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I hope that a few words from me will be allowed by the House upon this important subject. I am quite sure that there will be only one opinion throughout the House as to the extremely clear, interesting, and able speech in which the noble Lord who introduced this subject brought it before the House. I think the request he makes is an extremely moderate and reasonable one, and I sincerely hope your Lordships will agree to pass the Second Reading of the Bill, and, if necessary, to have it examined through the process of a Select Committee.

What is the ideal that we all, I think without distinction of Party, profess to set before ourselves in this matter? Our ideal of a governing body in a democratic State is that the will of the people should be made as clear as possible, so that all sections of the community may be satisfied that, whatever their opinions may be, if they are held by any considerable party, those opinions would be reflected in the governing body. After the speech of the noble Lord it is almost superfluous further to attempt to prove that, under our existing system, with all its considerable advantages, that result is not invariably attained. We have been conscious for many years that the present system does not always secure it, because in various kinds of elections various kinds of devices have been tried for the purpose of endeavouring to secure that ideal result.

Many of your Lordships recollect the provision of the minority vote in the three-cornered constituencies. That was an effort to give a representation to the minority which would not have been secured if those large constitutions elected their three Members upon a uniform poll. Then in our school board elections we have had the cumulative vote, a device which was popular when it was introduced, but the practical working of which did not secure all the advantages which were hoped from it. I do not think that the cumulative vote as a device for securing a more exact reflection of the opinion of the constituent body has now many friends.

More recently than that, in regard to county council and borough council elections in London and elsewhere, recourse has been had to the device of single member constituencies, in the hope and expectation that what was a minority in one constituency would be a majority in another, and that, upon the whole, by a sort of rough and ready process a fair result would be attained. But certainly there have been some remarkable instances in which we have failed by that device to secure the object we all profess to have in view. I leave the illustrations which the noble Lord gave of municipal elections where he left them. I do not profess to go into the question of applying the Bill to Parliamentary elections; it is not desirable on this occasion; but one may be allowed to draw from the experience of Parliamentary elections illustrations to show how uncertain the operation of our present system is.

It was commonly made a matter of complaint in the last Parliament, and I am far from saying unreasonable complaint, by the Party to which noble Lords opposite belong that both in the year 1895 and in the year 1900 results were attained in the Parliamentary elections which made the House of Commons elected in either of those years far from an exact reflex of the opinions of those who voted. It is possible to prove that very shortly. In the 1895 election there were in great Britain 481 contested seats—for this purpose I leave out of account the uncontested seats—and in those contested seats there was a difference between the two Parties in the State of only 25,000 votes, and the Conservatives were in that minority and yet they managed to secure 279 seats as against 202 obtained by the Liberals. However satisfactory that may have been to some of us, no one can say that it was a result which was an exact reflex of the opinion of those who voted, and that is all the length to which for the moment I wish to carry my illustration. But take the last election, the result of which gives more satisfaction to noble Lords opposite. There was a difference between the two great Parties of only 600,000 votes in the contested constituencies in England, and yet, whereas the Conservatives secured only 127 seats, their opponents got 338. No one, I venture to assert, will contend that in either of those cases the result was a scientific or satisfactory one.

Then, take the case of Wales. At the last election Wales had a poll of 52,000 Conservatives as against 123,000 Liberals and Radicals; there are thirty Members for Wales, and yet those 52,000 Conservatives are at this moment practically disfranchised, inasmuch as they have not one single Conservative Member in the House of Commons. Take, again, Scotland, with which I am more familiar. At the last election there were 238,000 Conservative votes polled and 374,000 Liberal and Radical votes. The Conservative Members for Scotland in the House of Commons number twelve, whereas the Liberal and Radical Members number sixty. A difference, therefore, which in mathematical accuracy ought to be three to two is five to one; or, to put it in another way, every Conservative Member from Scotland represents 20,000 voters and every Liberal 6,000. Whatever we may think of these anomalies, no one can say that the present is a scientifically accurate system, or one which, even as a matter of practical politics, is capable of reasonable defence. Indeed, the present method of voting emphasises the difference of opinion between one Party and another, and so perhaps creates more bitter feeling than would otherwise be the case.

If in our opinion every shade of opinion ought as far as possible to be represented, then I maintain it is perfectly clear that neither in our Parliamentary elections nor in municipal elections is that result attained. As a mere matter of practice we are not all of us bitter Party politicians. We are not all on one side Home Rulers and free traders, nor are we all on the other side Unionists and Tariff Reformers. There may be some people—I have heard of them—who are inclined to maintain the policy of free trade and yet who mistrust the policy of Home Rule in its widest aspect. It looks at the present time as if those who are in that unfortunate position might have difficulty in the country in finding a way of utilising their votes so as to suit their political views.

These illustrations are so trite that I almost apologise to the House for mentioning them, but at the same time I think they do show that if we are to have a scientific representation in Parliament of the differences of opinion throughout the country the present system fails altogether to secure it. The noble Lord opposite has shown that under our present system the thing may go even as far as this, that the minority may get a majority of seats. On the other hand, it is practically certain that the majority will almost always be unduly magnified in its power. Minorities may be in some parts of the country, as in Wales, permanently disfranchised. The present system unduly limits the choice of the electors and magnifies the swing of the pendulum. All this constitutes a serious indictment of our present system, and, whether by this proposal or some other on the same lines, a remedy I think must be found. I understand there is to be no opposition to the Bill, and I earnestly hope your Lordships will agree to the request of the noble Lord and give it a Second Reading.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): My Lords, I hope I may be permitted, not only for myself but also for my colleagues, to congratulate my noble friend behind me on the speech in which he has moved the Second Reading of this Bill. Lord Courtney told us that this was a small and a permissive measure, and the noble Lord who has just sat down considered it a reasonable and moderate one. I think most people will admit that, though it may be small and permissive, though it may be reasonable and moderate, yet it is likely to have very important results.

The noble Lord in charge of the Bill told us that the election of one-third of the Council every year prevented violent shocks and complete changes in the constitution of the bodies. I am not certain that there is not something to be said on the other side as well. Not very long ago there was general dissatisfaction in London as to the management of its government by the London County Council, and a great many speeches were made and leading articles written to prove that the credit of the London County Council was impaired, that the accounts were "cooked," and that there ought to be a commercial inquiry—whatever that may mean—into the conduct of those valuable public servants, the permanent officials of the Council. Last, but not least, there was to be a considerable reduction in the rates. About a year ago we were told that some people hoped there would be a reduction of at least 3s. or 4s. in the pound. The consequence of that was that there was a clean sweep of the Progressive Party in the Metropolis at the last London County Council election. The *personnel* of the County Council was entirely changed, and, if the accusations which were brought against the late majority in the Council were true, or only one half true, and if the reduction of taxation promised could only be carried out to the extent of one-fourth, it would have justified the clean sweep that was made in London. But I would point out that this clean sweep would have been absolutely impossible without the present system of election in London.

My noble friend who has brought forward this measure stated that the process of election in the Bill was very simple. Well, I do not think it is. As I look through the appendix to the Bill in which is set out an example, extending to six pages, of an election conducted on the system of proportional representation, I cannot help feeling pity for the returning officer. I have fought five very severe contests in connection with the London County Council, and have seen something of the way in which the elections are carried out, and I should heartily sympathise with the position of the returning officer under such a system as that proposed by the noble Lord. I think the ordinary returning officer would find himself in very deep water if elections were carried out in this way. However, my noble friend has declared that he would be satisfied if the Bill were sent to a Select Committee to be thrashed out, and, let us hope, to be put in a somewhat simpler form than it is at the present moment. On that understanding, I am empowered to say, on behalf of the Local Government Board, that the Government offer no opposition to the Second Reading. I hope that will satisfy my noble friend, and before sitting down I desire once more to congratulate him on the great success of the speech he has delivered.

LORD ASHBOURNE: My Lords, this debate has been extremely interesting. I daresay a great many of your Lordships, until you came down to the House this afternoon, had never seriously considered the subject, or, at any rate, the proposals that have been put forward in such a clear and able way by my noble friend Lord Courtney. The debate has, I venture to think, been also very instructive. I cannot say that this is a subject that I have ever given very earnest attention to, although I have some general acquaintance with it; but, until the speech of the noble Earl who has just sat down, I did not understand that there was a particle of difficulty in fully comprehending the proposal.

I am in some uncertainty as to the aspect in which this Bill is regarded by the noble Earl. It appeared to me that he wished to make a personally sympathetic but a Party non-committal speech, and, of course, that is not a feat easy of performance. It requires rather an acrobatic training and intelligence, but I think the noble Earl got through his task leaving us in a state of mind, I will not say confused, but a little uncertain as to the opinion of the Department on whose behalf he spoke. Most of your Lordships came to the House this afternoon with a good deal of curiosity as to how this important and interesting subject would be presented Large intellects and powerful minds have been applied to the question of proportional representation. There is a general impression that the subject is not interesting, and that it is doubtful how far it can be made clearly to enter into the minds of the ordinary voter. This Bill is, of course, introduced as a tentative measure. It is only applied to municipal elections, and then only in the most voluntary and permissive form. One municipality may adopt it, and, after two or three years experience of the system, drop it; but, if the system is found capable of such application as has been referred to, the acceptance of the principle may lead to further results.

Although the Bill is a small one, it is, in another sense, a very large one, for the teaching of experience may commend the application of this principle to the country as a whole. I do not think there has been any desire to treat the matter as a Party question. The present system is a rough and ready one. Under it, the majority prevails and the minority must look out for itself the best way it can. For myself, I agree that it is wise in all assemblies that differences of opinion should be represented honestly, fairly, and vigorously. I do not think there has been a single note of discord sounded as to the course that has been suggested as reasonable in dealing with an important proposal like the present made by a man so intellectually distinguished as Lord Courtney. I trust, therefore, that the Bill will be read a Second time and referred to a Select Committee, and that the Members of the Committee will consider the question fully and in all its bearings.

THE LORD PRIVY SEAL (The MARQUESS of RIPON): My Lords, I am not one of those to whom my noble friend, who has just sat down, alluded at the commencement of his speech. He then said that he thought the discussion of this subject was likely to be new to many Members of this House. That is not so in my case. I have been a student of this question for a great number of years. I have watched the various experiments which have been made in this direction, and which were mentioned to us this evening. It is a remarkable thing that as far as those experiments have gone they have not succeeded, and that, I think, indicates that we should be cautious in what we do in regard to this matter.

Lord Courtney has given his attention to this matter, I think, during almost the whole of his public life, and has presented it to us to-night in a very able and interesting speech. But my noble friend is an advocate. I hope noble Lords who serve on the Select Committee which is about to be appointed will look at the proposal in all its bearings. In the first instance, no doubt, there is the general proposition: is it desirable to have a system of proportional representation or not? My noble friend behind me, though he puts the question forward at the present moment in a very tentative manner, did not conceal from us what was the ultimate object he had in view, a very natural and proper object for a man holding his opinions—namely, that the system should afterwards be extended to Parliamentary elections. I hope those who consider this Bill in the Select Committee will bear that in mind, because whatever decision they may come to is very likely to have considerable effect upon opinion in respect to Parliamentary as well as municipal elections.

My noble friend who introduced the Bill spoke of Party spirit as an evil; I have been too long in public life not to have a very lively understanding of the many evils of the Party system, but in this country, with its Parliamentary traditions, you cannot have a Parliamentary system without a Party system at its back, and one of the evils of the day here and in other countries is, I think, the tendency to break down the Party connection and to split Parliament into sections. That is an evil, because such a system does not give the Government of the country sufficient authority and power. I hope that when this question is considered in the Select Committee these points will be carefully borne in mind.

I do not propose to go into the details of the Bill. My noble friend has given a remarkable pledge that he would convince all the Members of the Select Committee that the Bill ought to become law. I will only beg the Members of that Committee who will come under the fascinations of my noble friend to look very carefully at the complicated system proposed and endeavour to understand it, remembering that it is to be carried out, not by themselves, but by the returning officers and the unhappy voters, of whom many will be ladies. Joking apart, I do think it is a very complicated system, and that is one of the reasons why His Majesty's Government cannot give it their support as it is proposed.

There is another question—the amount of power which you are proposing to give to returning officers. Returning officers are very honourable and admirable persons, but I do not wish them to have more power in regard to the allotment of votes than is necessary. The system proposed would open a door which I should be glad not to see opened. Under this system, as I understand it—I may be wrong—in the allotment of votes a great deal will depend on the perfect and absolute honesty of the returning officer. I hope the Committee will not overlook that point, which seems to me to be one of considerable importance. I think that one who has given so much attention to this question for so many years, and who has such an earnest desire to see it adopted, should have every consideration from this House and every opportunity of placing his views before it. But while we assent to the Second Reading, not as implying assent to the principle of the Bill, but as implying only a desire that it should be fully and thoroughly considered by your Lordships, I do ask you to look at this question in all its aspects and on all its sides.

*LORD COURTNEY OF PENWITH: My Lords, I desire to express my great satisfaction at the course the discussion had taken, and my gratitude for the proposal to send the Bill to a Select Committee. If that Committee approaches the subject in a perfectly impartial spirit, even in one of hesitation, I believe I shall persuade them of the practicability of the measure. I would remind the noble Marquess that in 1880 we were both crossing the Channel, my noble friend to take up his great charge in India, I myself to spend a Whitsuntide holiday in Paris. My noble friend on that occasion said—

> "I suppose I shall return in five years to find you fighting the battle of proportional representation."

Twenty-seven years have passed and I am still fighting that battle. I regret there should be any degree of difference between my noble friend and myself. I feel persuaded that, in spite of his hesitation, if my noble friend could find it consistent with his duty and the appropriation of his public time to sit upon this Select Committee he would be convinced.

I could make some observations in reply to some of the things which have been said in the course of this discussion, but I will not trespass further, except perhaps to say this—that I do not admit the complete failure of all the experiments that have been tried. The limited vote was not a failure. It did extremely well so far as it went, and it was abandoned in pursuit of something which was thought to be better—single Member constituencies, which have certainly not proved better. And in respect to the much-abused cumulative vote, I may remind your Lordships that the official representatives of the Board of Education who gave evidence before the Select Committee who sat on the subject, expressed the opinion that without the cumulative vote the Education Act of 1870 could not have been worked. That vote was abandoned subsequently in consequence of a complete change in our organisation of education, but I cannot admit that it was a failure. I again express my great satisfaction at the course the debate has taken, and I accept very gratefully the proposal to refer the Bill to a Select Committee.

On Question, Bill read 2ª, and referred to a Select Committee.

THE COLONIAL SHIPPING CONFERENCE.

*LORD MUSKERRY: My Lords, I rise to call attention to the composition of the Colonial Shipping Conference, with particular reference to the representative capacity of the Imperial delegates; to ask whether any representative of seamen acted as an Imperial delegate, and, if so, by what representative body was he nominated, and what is its actual membership of British seamen; also to ask why the Imperial Merchant Service Guild, representing over 12,000 British captains and officers, was given no opportunity or representation on this Conference.

When Imperial delegates were appointed to sit on this Conference one would naturally have thought that those who risk their lives on the high seas would be given due representation. Yet what was actually the case? The Imperial delegates numbered twelve. Four were officials of the Board of Trade, one an official of the Colonial Office, and five were shipowners. I am given to understand that the interests of seamen were supposed to be represented by the President of a Seamen's and Firemen's Union, which I hear is practically extinct, and which offered free and cordial admission to any British or foreign seamen who would pay a subscription. The twelfth delegate was the President of the Board of Trade.

We find such a large and representative body as the Merchant Service Guild denied the right of representation. The Guild comprises a membership of over 12,000 certificated British captains and officers. These are the men, my Lords, who are experts in ships and seafaring. It is upon them that the chief cares, duties, responsibilities, and anxieties connected with merchant ships rest. Their specialised knowledge and experience would have been of immense value to the Conference, and a most essential form of representation was deliberately thrown away. I cannot regard the nautical advisor to the Board of Trade as in any way representative, for he, of course, is tied down by officialism, and it is some thirty years since he left the sea.

What was the cause of the defect in the constitution of the Conference which I bring to your Lordship's notice? I have my own ideas on this point. In the first place, the Merchant Service Guild, as a very progressive body, has persistently endeavoured to better the conditions and safen the lives of our seafarers. To promote safety of life at sea the Guild has, amongst other things, advocated the institution of a light load-line, and the necessity of British ships being compelled to carry a proper number of competent and certificated officers. They have also urged that British ships should be commanded and officered by British subjects.

Now, as the Board of Trade are well aware, our Colonies, particularly Australasia, appear to be in complete agreement with the claims of the Merchant Service Guild. For instance, New Zealand makes it imperative that captains and officers shall be British subjects, and that merchant ships shall be compelled to carry a sufficiency of certificated and competent officers. I find that the Report of the Royal Commission on the Australian Navigation Bill anticipates the few improvements in the conditions of seafarers which have been enacted in our recent Merchant Shipping Act. Better accommodation and living are recommended by the Commission. The long hours of labour entailed upon officers are commented upon, and a scale of certificated officers for vessels according to size agreed upon. One of the questions recommended by the Royal Commission for consideration at the Imperial Conference was one which I have, on many occasions, urged upon the Government without success, and that is the advisableness of a light load-line for ships in ballast.

I suppose that the weight of an Imperial delegate representing the Imperial Merchant Service Guild, combined with the inevitable support of the Colonial delegates on these questions, would have placed our own Board of Trade, or, rather, the Marine Department, who have always opposed any measures whose object was to diminish dangers to seamen, in a tight situation. This is the reason why such a representative was not appointed. The result has been that our seafarers of the Empire find that the Imperial Maritime Conference, from which they had hoped so much, has, to them, been practically barren of result. When I know the solicitude shown by Colonial Parliaments to seamen I must confess my surprise that our Colonial delegates at the Conference have been so moderate in their proposals. I think your Lordships will agree that it is necessary that the maritime profession, which is of such great importance to the Empire, should not be treated as a thing of naught in forming Maritime Conferences, which, without expert nautical representation, are, in effect, so much labour and money wasted.

The shipowners, whose interests were purely monetary, have had full representation, while the men who depend completely for their livelihood on the prosperity of the mercantile marine and who risk continually their lives, have been denied any representation. I may say that these men—the captains and officers—have a far greater interest in the prosperity of the mercantile marine than the shipowner, for the shipowner, if he so pleases, can withdraw his capital and invest it elsewhere, while the captains and officers, whose capital is their years of experience and high professional qualification, are unable to do so. The shipowner only risks his money, and not that even, for he mostly has the underwriter behind him; the captains and officers risk their lives and their professional reputations. Are we to understand that the Marine Department of the Board of Trade sets a higher value on property than on sailors' lives? From their attitude in the past it looks extremely like it. I say, my Lords, that at any Conference or Commission where matters concerning safety of life at sea are brought forward, if the men who are most vitally concerned in these subjects are not given due representation, and if their views and advice are not accorded the most careful consideration, it is a scandal and a farce.

THE EARL OF GRANARD: My Lords, in reply to the noble Lord, I entirely dissent from the view that officers were not represented in any way at the Conference. Captain Chalmers, who acted on behalf of the Board of Trade, has been nearly all his life at sea, and he very carefully looked after all the interests of officers. The Conference passed one resolution in the direction which the noble Lord desires, namely—

> "That no person should be employed as an officer on board any British ship registered in Australia or New Zealand, or engaging in the coasting trade of those colonies, who is not a British subject and thoroughly conversant with the English language."

The noble Lord asked about the seamen representation on the Conference. On the nomination of the President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Havelock Wilson attended, but he was nominated, not as representing any particular trade union, but because he has always taken the keenest interest in matters affecting seamen. The President sincerely regretted that he was unable to appoint a member of the Merchant Shipping Guild, but he felt it would be a mistake to increase the number of the members of the Conference, which was already large.

House adjourned at half-past Six o'clock, till to-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 30th April, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—Tyne Improvement Bill [Lords.]

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

Boston Spa Gas Bill; Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill; Swansea Harbour Bill.—Read a third time, and passed.

Brighouse Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill.—As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

London County Council (Money) Bill.—Read a second time, and committed.

Standing Orders.—Resolutions reported from the Select Committee:—

'That, in the case of the Central London Railway Bill, Petition for Additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to introduce their additional Provision if the Committee on the Bill think fit."

"That, in the case of the Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with:—That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, on the condition that the name of Edward Baring be struck out of Clause 4 of the Bill, unless his consent is proved before the Committee on the Bill:—That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

Resolutions agreed to.

Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [Lords].—Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill to be read a second time.—(*The Deputy Chairman.*)

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Judicature Acts, 1873 to 1894, with respect to the persons in whom the power of making Rules of Court under those Acts is vested." [Rule Committee Bill [Lords.]

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise Raymond Hill Baines to assume and bear the Christian Names of Henry Rodd in lieu of the Christian Names of Raymond Hill." [Baines' Name Bill [Lords.]

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to alter and enlarge the provisions of the charters incorporating the Royal Bank of Scotland and of an Act amending the same." [Royal Bank of Scotland [Lords.]

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to incorporate the President and Council of King Edward's Hospital Fund for London; to provide for the management of the fund: and for other purposes. [King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill [Lords.]

Royal Bank of Scotland Bill [Lords]; King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

Baines' Name Bill [Lords].—Read the first time; to be read a second time.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (PROVISION OF MEALS) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Paisley, against; to lie upon the Table.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Musselburgh, against; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against: From Musselburgh; and, West Kilpatrick; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Aberdeen; Bonnybridge; Denny and Dunnipace; Dundee; Glasgow (two); Kilmaurs; Kingston; Leith (three); Musselburgh; Portobello; and, Rutherglen; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition from Banwell, against; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petitions for legislation: From Hunslet; Lichfield; Lincoln; North Bierley; Pontypridd; and, Tynemouth; to lie upon the Table.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Renfrewshire, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Copy presented, of Licence granted to Rose Smith, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Elizabeth Fry Refuge, London, E. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL CONFERENCE.

Copy presented, of *Précis* of Proceedings of the Colonial Conference, 15th to 26th April, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT).

Copy presented, of Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1906 by the Hydrographer [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Deduction from Grants to County Sligo in respect of Land Purchase.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH (Sligo, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state in detail the calculations from which the sum of £1,506 19s. 7d., deducted in respect of land purchase from grants payable to the county council of Sligo, was arrived at, also the calculations on which the sum of £66 17s. 5d. was directly deducted from the share of the Sligo urban district, and the sum of £79 from the share of the guardians of Sligo union; will full particulars of all deductions from grants be furnished to all public bodies concerned; is he aware that Sligo borough is one of the corporate towns in Ireland in which the rating powers of the municipal councils are limited by local Acts; and can he state the amount of the deductions in the other corporate towns similarly situated.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The £1,506 19s. 7d. deducted from the grants to the county Sligo includes £174 5s. 6d. drawn by the Irish Land Commission in respect of arrears, etc., under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891. The balance of £1,332 14s. 1d., drawn under the Land Act, 1903, is made up of arrears of annuities £61 6s. 4d., and deficiency of income £1,271 7s. 9d. The arrears of annuities are the arrears actually existing in county Sligo, and the deficiency of income is the proportion of the total deficiency under this head chargeable to county Sligo on the basis of the advances outstanding at the close of the year immediately preceding. The sum of £1,506 19s. 7d. is the total liability for the whole county, and other local bodies in the county besides the county council contribute to make good this amount. The sum of £66 17s. 5d., directly deducted from the share of the Sligo urban district, was calculated as follows:—The net indebtedness of all the counties in Ireland in respect of land purchase (£73,218 12s. 5d.) was added to the sum available for distribution (£85,888 16s. 3d.), giving a total of £159,107 8s. 8d. The shares of the local bodies in county Sligo in this total amount were ascertained, in accordance with the basis of distribution provided by the Probate Duties (Scotland and Ireland) Act, 1888, to be the sums set forth in column 1 of the first appended statement. The shares of the local bodies in the total liability of the county were then calculated proportionately to these sums, the result being given in column 2 of the statement. In the case of the Sligo urban district it will be seen that this liability comes to the amount stated in the Question. The liability of the ratepayers in the urban district (namely £79) in respect of the deduction made from the share of the Sligo Board of Guardians was calculated on the proportion of the valuation of the urban district to that of the entire union, the valuation of these areas being, respectively, £22,324 and £104,216.

It is the fact that the rating powers of the Sligo Corporation are limited for certain purposes under the local Acts. A further statement is annexed, showing the amount of the deductions in the case of the five non-county boroughs.

Statement showing the shares of the local bodies in county Sligo in the sum of £159,107 8s. 8d. Death Duty Grant (of which £73,218 12s. 5d. had been withdrawn from the Guarantee Fund), and the deductions on account of the county liability amounting to £1,506 19s. 7d. :—

Unions and road authorities.	Share in the sum of £159,107 8*s.* 8*d.*			Deductions from foregoing shares (proportionately) of the county liability.		
Unions :	£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*
†Boyle (part of)	206	1	2	122	19	11
Dromore West	240	18	6	143	17	10
Sligo	610	3	6	364	4	1
Tobercurry	284	17	6	170	3	3
Road Authorities :—						
Sligo Urban District	111	17	10	66	17	5
Sligo County Council	1,069	14	6	638	17	1
Total	2,523	13	0	1,506	19	7

† Remainder of union in county Roscommon.

Statement showing the sums deducted from the shares of non-county boroughs in the Death Duty Grant recently distributed :—

Non-county boroughs.	Amount deducted from share in Grant as a road authority.		
	£	s.	d.
Clonmel	83	7	5
Drogheda	12	13	3
Kilkenny	43	12	0
Sligo	66	17	5
Wexford	34	8	7

Deduction from Grants in respect to Land Purchase.

Mr. McHUGH : To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, in regard to the £70,996 deducted in respect of land purchase transactions from grants to public bodies in Ireland, how much of that sum has been deducted in the case of each of the county boroughs Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Belfast, and Londonderry, and how much in the case of each of the non-county boroughs Kilkenny, Drogheda, Wexford, Clonmel, and Sligo.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) As has been stated by my hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury, the sum of £70,996 refers exclusively to the liability under the Land Act of 1903. In calculating the amounts to be deducted from the several local bodies, the Local Government Board had to take into consideration the liability under the Act of 1891 as well, making a total of £73,218. The appended statements show the liability of each of the bodies mentioned in the Question in respect of the latter amount. It would require fresh calculations to determine the liability of these bodies under the Act of 1903 alone, but, having regard to the small amount to be deducted in respect of the Act of 1891, the information now furnished will probably be sufficient for the hon. Member's purpose—

Statement showing the sums deducted from the shares of county boroughs in the Death Duty Grant recently distributed.

County boroughs.	Amount deducted from share in grant as a road authority.	Amount deducted from guardians' share of grant payable (on their behalf) to the county borough councils.
	£ *s.* *d.*	£ *s.* *d.*
Belfast	493 10 11	282 19 6
Cork	458 7 9	357 16 5
Dublin	526 9 1	360 13 0
Limerick	368 16 5	307 17 9
Londonderry	160 0 3	119 0 10
Waterford	52 3 1	72 11 5

Statement showing the sums deducted from the shares of boroughs other than county boroughs in the Death Duty Grant recently distributed—

Boroughs.	Amount deducted from share in grant as a road authority.
	£ s. d.
Clonmel - - -	83 7 5
Drogheda - - -	12 13 3
Kilkenny - - -	43 12 0
Sligo - - - -	66 17 5
Wexford - - -	34 8 7

MR. P. A. McHUGH: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the sums of £66 17s. 5d. and £79, deducted from the grants payable to the Sligo Corporation and to the Sligo Board of Guardians in respect of the urban district respectively, are included in the sum of £1,506 deducted from the grants payable to Sligo County Council; whether the Borough of Sligo, being under its local Act responsible for a portion of the county-at-large charges, is bound to make good its portion of this £1,506; whether the average yearly contribution to the corporation of Sligo from the Local Taxation Account was, for the five years ended 31st March, 1906, only £170; and can he say how much of the Local Taxation Grant will be payable to the corporation for the year 1906–7 after deducting the sums chargeable against it for losses in connection with land purchase.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The sums mentioned in the Question are included in the total liability of the county, namely, £1,506 19s. 7d. The amount deducted from the share of the Sligo County Council in respect of this liability is £638 17s. 1d., and, so far as this latter sum would have been devoted to defray county-at-large charges, the Sligo Urban District will have to make good the portion which it may be required to contribute under its local Acts. The Local Government Board have no particulars to enable them to calculate the liability of the urban district on this head. The amount paid directly to the Sligo Corporation for the five years mentioned in the Question out of the Death Duty Grant (which forms portion of the Local Taxation Account), was £166, but the corporation received a further sum of £52 out of the Local Taxation Account in respect of sanitary salaries. The third instalment of the Death Duty Grant for the year 1906–7 will be paid about July next, but the amount then to be distributed cannot yet be stated. No further deductions for the year 1906–7 will be made in which the Sligo Corporation will participate.

Deduction from the Irish Land Purchase Guarantee Fund—County Cork.

Mr. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state on what estate or estates in Cork County the sum of £831 arrears of purchase annuities which have been deducted from the Guarantee Fund have accrued; how much of these arrears has been paid up since the 31st January, 1907; how is the sum of £4,050, also deducted from the county share of the fund, arrived at; whether adequate particulars with full details of these stoppages are furnished to the respective councils; and what means, if any, do the county councils possess for testing the correctness of the Treasury deductions.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) My hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. For the purpose of computing the arrears to be drawn from the Guarantee Fund, reference is made solely to the deficiency of each county as a whole and not to the various estates within the county. The hon. Member will, however, find in Table 159, on page 144 of the Report of the Land Commissioners for 1906 (Cd. 3113), a statement giving particulars of the case of every tenant purchaser who at the date of the Report was one year and upwards in arrears. Out of the arrears of £831 mentioned in the Question, the sum of £544 14s. 8d., has since been paid. I understand that the sum of £4,050 represents the proportion chargeable to county Cork in respect of a total charge of £61,877 for deficiency of income. The different items included are as follows:—

	£
Unearned dividend on issue of stock	1,554
Advance dividend - - - - -	893
Interest due but not received - -	1,015
Unproductive balance - - -	588

Up to the present it has not been considered necessary to inform the county councils of the amounts stopped from the county grants, which have hitherto been inconsiderable, but the amounts of the recent deductions have been fully published, and I am now, in consultation with the Treasury, endeavouring to devise means of letting the county councils know the amount of their liabilities in sufficient time before they strike their rates. I am not aware that county councils possess any means for testing the correctness of the deductions.

Evicted Tenants on the Leader Estate—Application of Mrs. Anne Connell.

Mr. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application from Mrs. Anne Connell, of Coolmahane, Kilbrin, Kanturk, county Cork, claiming reinstatement as an evicted tenant on the Leader estate, at Currass; is the farm from which Mrs. Connell was evicted at present in the occupation of a planter named John Fitzpatrick; can he say whether this man has expressed his willingness to Mr. Vaughan, estates inspector, to surrender the evicted farm on receiving compensation; what were the nature of the negotiations which passed between the estates inspector and Fitzpatrick; and will he state whether the evicted tenant's claim has been ruled on; and, if so, with what result.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have received the application referred to and have had the case investigated by their inspector. They are about to consider their inspector's Report, and in the meantime do not think it desirable to enter into details.

Officers Attached to the War Office.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): To ask the Secretary of State for War how many general and how many other officers were attached to the War Office in 1897, and how many general officers and other officers are so attached at the present time, and how many general officers and how many other officers were in staff employ at Home in 1897, and how many are so employed at the present time; and what is the difference in the public charge.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*)

Military Headquarter Staff, 1st April, 1897.

		£
1	field marshal - -	4,500
14	generals, lieutenant-generals, and major-generals - - -	23,830
74	other officers - -	48,630
89		76,960

Military Headquarter Staff and Staff of Inspector-General of the Forces, 1st April, 1907.

		£
1	field marshal - -	4,000
20	generals, lieutenant-generals and major-generals - - -	32,800
4	brigadier-generals -	5,400
140	other officers - -	90,248
165		132,448

Statement showing the number of Staff Officers who were employed at home on 1st April, 1897, and on 1st April, 1907, together with their emoluments.

Rank.	1st April, 1897.		1st April, 1907.	
	Number.	Annual Cost.	Number.	Annual Cost.
		£		£
Generals, lieutenant-generals, and major-generals - - - -	23	41,358	22	43,600
Brigadier-generals - - -	—	—	32	32,600
Other officers - - - -	158*	98,051	182†	102,790‡
	181	139,409	236	178,990

* Includes three officers for the remount and registration establishment.

† Includes nine remount officers, seven district barrack officers, and one officer for supply duties.

‡ Includes £6,200 retired pay, which is incorporated in the pay of certain officers.

Appointment of Medical Officer at British Embassy at Tokio.

SIR W. J. COLLINS (St. Pancras, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether an appointment to the medical officership to the British Embassy at Tokio was made in the early part of this year; if so, whether the vacancy was advertised; whether the gentleman appointed is a British subject; and, if not, whether he holds any medical qualification recognised as registerable by the General Medical Council.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) There was no vacancy. The medical adviser to His Majesty's Embassy proceeded on leave, and made arrangements for a competent substitute to act during his absence.

Regular Troops serving in India.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary of State for India, if he can inform the House what was the number of Regular troops, British and Native, serving in India with the colours in 1900, 1901 and 1902 and what is the number so serving at the date of the last Return; whether he can also state the expenditure of India on military services and strategic railways in 1900, 1901, and 1902, and that actually incurred in 1906–7, and the relation of numbers to cost as shown by dividing the figures of charge by those of numbers in each case.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The number of Regular troops including officers, British and Native, serving in

India with the colours in the years stated was as follows—

1st April, 1900, 186,352; 1st April, 1901, 190,140; 1st April, 1902, 195,290, and on the 1st December, 1906, it was 226,177.

Note.—During the years, 1900, 1901, and 1902 from 20,000 to 27,000 troops were serving in South Africa, China, and the Colonies.

The net expenditure of India on effective military service was—

	£
1900–1 - - -	11,347,997
1901–2 - - -	11,905,994
1902–3 - - -	13,338,536

The actual expenditure for 1906–7 is not yet known; the latest estimated expenditure for that year was £15,733,900. On the basis of these figures the relation of numbers to cost, determined in the manner suggested by the right hon. Member, is as follows—

	£	*s.*	*d.*
1900 - - - -	60	17	11
1901 - - - -	62	12	4
1902 - - - -	68	6	0
1906–7 - - -	69	11	3

The expenditure on strategic railways in the years mentioned was as follows—

	£
1900–1 - - -	78,519
1901–2 - - -	221,102
1902–3 - - -	220,714
1906–7 - - -	560,000

The figures for 1906–7 are estimates only.

Compulsory Reserve Funds for Limited Companies in Foreign Countries.

MR. HYDE (Wednesbury): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is now in a position to give any information with reference to the existence of compulsory reserve funds for limited liability companies in foreign countries.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) I have now obtained information from France, Germany, Italy, and Belgium on the question of compulsory reserve fund. In France, Germany, and Belgium joint stock companies are compelled to set aside 5 per cent. of their net profits for the formation of a reserve fund until the reserve fund is equal to 10 per cent. of the company's capital. In Italy the law is that a similar proportion of the net profits should be placed to reserve until the reserve fund is equal to 20 per cent. of the company's capital. In none of the above countries are there any special rules governing the investment of moneys forming the reserve funds of joint stock companies.

Trade between Great Britain and the Colonies.

MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire): To ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state with reference to Canada, Australia, New Zealand, British South Africa, the other British Colonies as a whole, and the Indian Empire, respectively, and also as regards them all in the aggregate, what was the value of imports exported thither from the United Kingdom, and what was the amount of import duties levied upon these there during the year 1906; and what was the value of exports imported thence to the United Kingdom and what was the amount of the duties levied upon these in the United Kingdom during the same year.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) It has already been explained, in Answers to Questions, that particulars are not available as to the countries of origin of dutiable goods cleared for consumption in the United Kingdom. Similar conditions obtain in the case of India and the Colonies, with the exception of Canada. I am consequently unable to give the information in the precise form desired, but a Return which has been ordered on the Motion of my hon. friend the Member for Preston will throw some light on the question.

Vegetable Adulterants of Coffee.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the President of the Board of Trade what was the quantity of legalised vegetable adulterants of coffee introduced into the United Kingdom in 1906.

(*Answered by Mr. Lloyd-George.*) The quantities of chicory and of vegetable matter (other than chicory) applicable to the uses of chicory or coffee imported into the United Kingdom in 1906 were as follows—

	Cwts.
Chicory, raw or kiln dried - -	90,301
Chicory, roasted or ground - -	1,264
Other vegetable matter applicable to the uses of chicory or coffee	6

These figures are exclusive of the chicory or other vegetable substances imported mixed with coffee. The total quantity of such mixtures imported in 1906 was 845 lbs.

Irish Ordnance Maps—Roman Catholic Churches.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if, in view of the fact that in the revised Ordnance Survey maps of Ireland, Catholic churches are invariably set down as R. C. chapels, he will take the necessary steps to have these churches set down on the maps under their proper designation.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) Perhaps I may be allowed to answer this Question. I understand that Roman Catholic churches are not always described as chapels on Ordnance Survey maps, the practice being to give the names as they are locally known. If my hon. friend will give me information as to any particular cases in which this course has not been followed, my noble friend will be glad to look into the matter. In any case he would wish to consult the wishes of the religious body to which a place of worship belongs.

Irish Banks and Land Purchase Money.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, if in view of the fact that for many years past under arrangement with the Treasury the joint stock banks of Scotland receive in annual rotation, and hold for a limited period, the Customs and Inland Revenue moneys raised in that country, he sees any substantial objection to following a like precedent in Ireland in the case of Land Purchase moneys; and whether he is prepared to instruct the Treasury authorities to make arrangements under which, year about, the approved joint stock banks of Ireland shall be appointed receivers of Land Purchase moneys, with the understanding that interest at a fair rate shall be paid upon all lodgments.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Bank of Ireland is by law the banker of the Government in Ireland. Consequently there is no necessity to distribute Government business among a number of banks in that country, as is done in Scotland, where no single bank occupies a position corresponding to that of the Bank of Ireland. Purchase annuity instalments under The Irish Land Act, 1903, may be remitted through any bank, and a statement to that effect is printed on the receivable orders.

Case of Smallpox on H.M.S. "Defiance."

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if a second-class domestic serving on H.M.S. "Defiance" at Devonport has been taken ill of small-pox; if so, will he say whether the patient was vaccinated; and, if so, upon what date.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) A second-class domestic serving in H.M.S. "Defiance" has been attacked with small-pox. He was vaccinated as an infant, but the actual date is not known. He was not re-vaccinated. He is suffering from an attack of modified small-pox, such as follows ordinarily in persons partially protected by infantile vaccination.

Appointments to Admiralty Messengerships.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many appointments have been made to permanent messengerships at the Admiralty since January, 1906; and what was the occupation of the individual men prior to appointment.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Since January, 1906, fifteen appointments to the staff of Admiralty messengers have been made. Of this number eight were naval pensioners and seven marine pensioners.

Income-Tax on Incomes derived from a Wasting Security.

MR. LUPTON: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, if a person has a fluctuating income derived from a wasting security, such as royalties from a coal mine, and has to save half the income to make provision for the future, will Income-Tax be levied on the scale of earned or unearned income.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) Following the Select Committee, we propose to base the distinction upon the Answer to the question whether the income is or is not the product of the personal exertion of the recipient. The income derived from securities clearly cannot be regarded as "earned" merely because the source from which it comes may be liable to exhaustion.

Action of Police Inspector Cruise.

Mr. FLYNN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the attention of the constabulary authorities has been called to the action of a police inspector named Cruise, at the recent county and city assizes in Cork, in arbitrarily excluding from the court-house respectable members of the public, including jurors, Press-men, witnesses, and other parties having legitimate business to transact; is he aware that the conduct of this inspector was censured by the Lord Chief Justice when the facts were brought to his notice; are the authorities aware of the numerous complaints against this inspector by the people of Charleville, in respect to frequent vexatious prosecutions which have generally been dismissed; will he say how many prosecutions against licensed traders have been instituted by this inspector within the past twelve months, and how many of them have been dismissed; is he aware that he recently brought a prosecution against a man named Coleman for alleged shebeening, and that the bench, consisting of a resident magistrate and three local justices, summarily dismissed the charge; and will he say whether the constabulary authorities will communicate with Inspector Cruise regarding the discharge of his ordinary police duty.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) On the occasion in question the court-house was inconveniently crowded, and the Lord Chief Justice remarked that a witness could not be heard owing to the confusion in Court. District Inspector Cruise, who was in charge of the police arrangements, thereupon directed the police to refuse admittance to persons other than those who had business in Court. Two persons are stated to have felt aggrieved at being questioned by the police. One, a reporter, was at once admitted on stating his business. The other, a juror, turned away without stating his business. He was, however, recognised by another policeman, and invited to enter, but refused to do so. On the following day the Lord Chief Justice expressed in Court his approval of the district inspector's action. No complaints have been received in respect of prosecutions instituted by the district inspector. During the past year he has taken forty-six prosecutions under the Licensing Laws. There were eighteen dismissals and twenty-eight convictions. A recent prosecution for shebeening was dismissed, but in that case an appeal by the district inspector is pending. The Inspector-General is satisfied with the district inspector's performance of his duty, and sees no reason for communicating with him in the matter.

Publication of the Calendar of Irish Justiciary Rolls and Statutes and Ordinances.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what progress has been made with the publication, in eight volumes, of the Calendar of the Justiciary Rolls of Ireland up to the eighteenth year of Richard II., as well as of the Statutes and Ordinances of the early Parliaments and Great Councils of Ireland, promised last year by Mr. Bryce; and who is responsible for their publication.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The first volume of the Calendar of Justiciary Rolls of Ireland was issued in June, 1906. About half of the second volume is in type, and the remainder has been completed in manuscript. The first volume of the Statutes and Ordinances referred to is in print and will shortly be published, and the material for the second volume is nearly ready for press. The Irish Record Office is responsible for the preparation of these volumes, and His Majesty's Stationery Office for their publication.

eduction from Grants to Wexford County Council.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if deductions have been made from the death duty grant payable to the Wexford County Council from the initiation of the Local Government (Ireland) Act to the present; and if so, how much, and in what year or years; whether, in the event of the Irish Land Commission recovering the amount deducted, or any part of it, the amount so recovered will be credited to the county; and if he will arrange that in future a statement shall be furnished to each county council in Ireland giving the total amount of this grant and the amount allocated to each county, showing also the manner in which the calculation has been arrived at, in time for the consideration by each county council before the striking of its rate, and similarly corresponding particulars in respect of the new Labourers Act Grant.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The following statement shows the sums deducted from the death duty grant payable to the county council of Wexford, in each year from 1900 to 1907:—

Year ended 31st March. 1	In respect of Payments made for Guardians. 2	In respect of Payment to the Council as a Road Authority. 3
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1900 -	373 17 1	338 9 11
1901 -	491 17 0	446 1 3
1902 -	504 4 5	456 15 6
1903 -	77 11 3	70 4 5
1904 -	298 19 11	270 11 4
1905 -	271 5 11	245 8 5
1906 -	Included in 1907	—
1907 -	1,404 11 1	1,271 15 1

The sums entered in column 3 were those deducted from the share of the county council as a road authority. Those in column 2 were made from the shares payable for the guardians, these payments being made on their behalf through the county council. As I have already stated, the Treasury are considering the question of devising means whereby county councils shall in future be supplied with information as to the allocation of the grant before they strike their rates. If, as is presumed, the "new Labourers' Act Grant" means the new method of distribution of the Exchequer grant, there will be no difficulty in informing county councils, before they strike their rates, of the approximate share of each rural district in their counties in the grant, as apportioned in accordance with Section 18 of the Act of last session.

Public Trustee Act—Suggested Extension to Ireland.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if he will consider the advisability of extending to Ireland the provisions of the Public Trustee Act passed last session for England.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) His Majesty's Government will, at a suitable opportunity, consider the question of introducing legislation for Ireland upon the lines of the Public Trustee Act of last session, but in the present state of public business it does not seem possible that such legislation can be introduced in the near future.

Duke of York's School—Transfer of Boys to Queen Victoria Memorial School.

Mr. HORNIMAN (Chelsea): To ask the Secretary of State for War, as there is ample space on the site near Dover, why is not accommodation provided for the same number of boys as are now at the Duke of York's School, in Chelsea; is it proposed to pay for those transferred to the Queen Victoria Memorial School in Scotland; for what reason is it that the boys are to be transferred to another charity; and is this part of the original scheme.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The new school will consist of eight houses of sixty boys. It was considered that, in view of the establishment of the Queen Victoria School, the increased capital and annual expenditure involved by the construction of a ninth house would not be necessary. This arrangement is a modification of the original scheme. It is not proposed to effect any of the necessary reduction of establishment by transfers to the Queen Victoria School.

Appointment to War Office Messengerships.

SIR SAMUEL SCOTT: To ask the Secretary of State for War how many appointments to permanent messengerships have been made at the War Office since January, 1906; and what was the occupation of the individual men prior to appointment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) Three appointments have been made. The men previous to the date of permanent employment were employed as temporary messengers and are all three ex-soldiers.

Norwegian Trawlers in the Moray Firth.

SIR GEORGE DOUGHTY (Great Grimsby): To ask the Prime Minister whether there is any arrangement between His Majesty's Government or the Scottish Fishery Board and the Government of Norway to permit Norwegian trawlers to be boarded and English fishermen arrested or given up outside the three-mile limit when the vessel has committed no offence for which the owner or master can be made responsible; under what law of Scotland English fishermen are prosecuted who are serving under contract under a foreign flag, when the vessel is fishing legally under the North Sea Convention and International law; and whether he is aware that the sheriff held that the English fisherman was subordinate to the master in offences committed within the three-mile limit when the vessel was fishing illegally, but in the cases of prosecution under the local Scottish by-law the sheriff held that the first fishermen were responsible and sentenced them to imprisonment, although the master was not prosecuted, and the vessel had committed no offence against national or International law.

(*Answered by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.*) There is no arrangement between His Majesty's Government and that of Norway to the effect suggested by the hon. Member, but the Norwegian Government have intimated that orders have been issued to the Fishery Director of Norway to warn all owners of Norwegian fishing boats who trawl in the Moray Firth to cease from so doing, and not to expect the support of their Government in the case of proceedings against them in Scotland. The law under which English and other British subjects are prosecuted is the Herring Fishery Act of 1889, which is not a law of Scotland, but one passed by the Parliament of the United Kingdom. I am not aware of the particular declaration by the sheriff to which the hon. Member refers. When prosecutions are taken against British subjects for illegal fishing under the Act of 1889, it is in respect of their individual breach of the law of their own country and not of the action of the vessel in which they were serving.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Coastguard Inquiry.

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Inter-departmental Committee on His Majesty's Coastguard have submitted their Report; and what opportunity this House will have of considering and discussing the whole matter before any action is taken.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The Committee's Report has been received, but has not yet been considered. No action will be taken until Vote A is before the House next year.

The Royal Marines.

MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it is the intention of the Government to alter the constitution of the corps of Royal Marines by providing that in future they shall not be commanded, as now, by officers specially attached to the corps, but by naval officers; and, if so, whether naval officers doing military duty with the Royal Marines will wear the uniform of the corps or naval uniform.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I must refer my hon. friend to the memorandum of 16th December, 1902 (Cd. 1385), which provided that all cadets entering the Royal Navy, whether to serve in the Executive, Engineers, or Marines, should receive similar training. A decision on the second part of the Question is not required for some years.

Camp Pay for Territorial Infantry Soldiers.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what will be the whole sum of money received by the territorial infantry soldier under the modified Army scheme for every day in camp, and what will he receive in kind.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): A private in the territorial infantry will receive in money for every day in camp pay at the rate of one shilling a day and the ordinary Government ration in kind. A messing and camp allowance of one shilling a day per man will be paid to the commanding officer to be expended by him in improving the messing and adding to the soldier's comfort. Non-commissioned officers will be similarly paid at the rates obtaining for their ranks in the Regular Forces, and will in addition receive separation allowances for their wives and families in accordance with the regular scale. The uniform necessary for all ranks will be provided at the public expense.

MR. ASHLEY: Are we to understand that the messing allowance will be paid to the commanding officers and not to privates, and that all non-commissioned officers are to receive the separation allowance?

MR. HALDANE: According to the regulations which obtain for Regulars provision is made for the separation allowance for non-commissioned officers. It will probably be found convenient that the messing allowance should be handled by the commanding officer.

MR. ASHLEY: Are we to understand then that the right hon. Gentleman has changed his plan and that all non-commissioned officers will receive the separation allowance?

MR. HALDANE: No, Sir. No change has been made. A statement was made in the Financial Estimates providing for the separation allowance to non-commissioned officers.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Has the right hon. Gentleman not been able to reconsider the question of granting the separation allowance to married privates in the Territorial Force?

MR. HALDANE: It would be a very large grant and would enormously increase the cost of the Territorial Army.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): The right hon. Gentleman says non-commissioned officers without exception will have the allowance, and the Estimate says half the non-commissioned officers. Will he correct the Estimate?

MR. HALDANE: Does the Estimate say half?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Half the non-commissioned officers and no privates. Will the right hon. Gentleman consider whether before the financial Resolution, or the debate on the Report of the financial Resolution, or Clause 3, he will circulate an Estimate revised on the points on which he has made statements subsequent to the Estimates?

MR. HALDANE: I will look into the matter. The Bill does not determine this matter. It is a matter of administration which must be decided by the House on the Vote for the Territorial Army.

Fleetwood Camp.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if it is proposed to train the same number of troops at Fleetwood this year as last.

Mr. HALDANE: Four battalions of Militia trained at Fleetwood last year, and the same number will train there this year. Three regiments of Royal Garrison Artillery Volunteers will train there this year as last year.

General Army Staff.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what is the estimated cost of a general staff for the service of the Empire.

Mr. HALDANE: There is no apparent reason why the resolution passed by the Conference with the Colonial Premiers should entail any substantial addition to the cost of the General Staff.

Wages at Pimlico and Woolwich Government Factories.

Mr. T. F. RICHARDS (Wolverhampton, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can say how many adult male employees there are employed at the Pimlico Clothing Factory and Woolwich Arsenal whose wages do not amount to 30s. for a full working week.

Mr. HALDANE: At the Royal Army Clothing Department there are 514 adult male employees whose wages do not amount to 30s. a week. At the Royal Arsenal there are 4,124 such employees who earn less than 30s. for a full working week. There are also 3,442 men in the Ordnance Factories engaged on piece work who are rated at less than 30s. a week, most of whom earn more than that amount.

Sub-Target Rifles.

Mr. GUY BARING (Winchester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any decision has yet been come to as to the adoption of the sub-target rifle by the War Office.

Mr. HALDANE: The reply is in the negative.

Mr. GUY BARING: Has it been decided that these sub-targets shall not be taken up by the War Office?

Mr. HALDANE: They are already in use in a great many battalions.

Officers Attached to the War Office.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many general and how many other officers were attached to the War Office in 1897, and how many general officers and other officers are so attached at the present time, and how many general officers and how many other officers were in staff employ at Home in 1897, and how many are so employed at the present time; and what is the difference in the public charge.

Mr. HALDANE: The figures are too long to read out to the House, but I will have them printed with the Votes and Proceedings.†

Bhagalpur District Magistrate.

Mr. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that Mr. F. F. Lyall, the district magistrate at Bhagalpur, has been using his influence to prevent the local gentry from taking part in political movements; whether, when the matter was brought to the attention of the Government, the facts were not disputed, but the action of the magistrate was excused on the ground that he ought to take every opportunity of talking freely and confidentially with Indian gentlemen about many things; and whether, in view of such action and such excuse, steps will be taken to prevent their recurrence in future.

The UNDER-SECRETARY of STATE for INDIA (Mr. Charles Hobhouse, Bristol, E.): No official Papers have reached us, but as the Secretary of State understands the newspaper reports, he hardly sees why, if Indian gentlemen like to talk freely and confidentially with a district magistrate, we should interfere. Of course, if any specific evidence of the improper use of his influence by the magistrate is brought to the Secretary of State's notice, he will make inquiry.

*Sir H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): Is the hon. Gentleman aware that in this particular case the magistrate sent for the local gentry and used his influence with them and that they did not go to him voluntarily?

---

† See Cols. 672–3

MR. HOBHOUSE: No such evidence is before us. As I have said we have no official Papers.

The Indian Budget.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is in a position to state when the discussion on the Indian Budget will be taken.

MR. HOBHOUSE: I hope during the first week or ten days after the Whitsun holidays.

Opium Shops in India.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will give the number of shops licensed for the sale of opium in India during the years 1903–4, 1904–5, 1905–6, and 1906–7, respectively.

MR. HOBHOUSE: The number of shops were 9,001 in 1903–4; 9,024 in 1904–5; 8,960 in 1905–6; the figures for 1906–7 are not yet available.

Indian Excise and Customs Revenue.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state what was the net Excise and Customs revenues on liquors and drugs consumed in India during the years 1903–4, 1904–5, and 1905–6, respectively; and what is the estimated revenue from these sources during the current year.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: The figures approximately are 1903–4, £5,476,000; 1904–5, £5,861,000; 1905–6, £6,281,000; 1907–8, £6,510,000.

Chartered Company—Rhodesian Complaints.

MR. STANGER (Kensington, N.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Lord Selborne, in the course of his visit to Rhodesia last November, received a number of deputations who made various complaints against the Chartered Company; whether these complaints have been transmitted to the Colonial Office; whether the Government are taking or have taken any steps to remedy the grievances complained of; whether Lord Selborne has made a Report of his visit or of any similar complaints made to him more recently; and whether Papers on the subject can be laid upon the Table.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): Yes, Sir. Lord Selborne, in the course of his visit to Rhodesia last November, received various deputations who made certain complaints against the Chartered Company. The High Commissioner duly communicated these complaints to the Secretary of State. The proposal was made that the differences between the company and the inhabitants of Southern Rhodesia should be inquired into by a Royal Commission, but the Secretary of State is not prepared to recommend such an appointment. As Lord Elgin was informed that certain of the Directors of the Company were shortly going out to Southern Rhodesia to discuss matters of complaint with the people on the spot, he did not think it necessary to take any immediate action. No good purpose would be served by merely laying the complaints so far as they have been received in the Colonial Office.

Trinidad Tariff on Swedish Matches.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that the duty on Swedish matches entering Trinidad has been reduced from sixty cents per gross to thirty-six cents per gross, amounting in a loss to general revenue of £2,000; and whether, in view of the effect of such reduction upon the local match industry at Port of Spain, employing some eighty people, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

MR. CHURCHILL: The revision of the Trinidad tariff has recently been under consideration, but the Secretary of State is not yet aware what alterations are proposed. He understands, however, that they are expected to result in an increase of revenue; and it is possible that they may include a reduction of the import duty on matches.

Coolie Riot at Couva, Trinidad.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he is aware that a riot recently took place among the indentured coolies on Perseverance Estate, Couva, Trinidad, resulting in the murder of William M'Kenzie, senior overseer; that discontent exists among the indentured coolies, seventy from the Kleinwort Estate being charged at the Couva police court during January, February, and March for various offences; and, if so, will he order an investigation into the whole of the circumstances.

Mr. CHURCHILL: No information has as yet been received on the subject of the riot referred to, but the Governor will be asked for a Report on the matters referred to in the hon. Member's Question.

Sir A. Swettenham.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether all the correspondence which passed between this Government and Sir Alexander Swettenham, in relation to the Admiral Davis incident and to his retirement, has been published; and, if not, will he lay it upon the Table of the House.

Mr. CHURCHILL: No Sir. There is a considerable volume of correspondence upon the details of the incident to which the hon. Member refers; but his Majesty's Government have decided, after careful consideration of all the circumstances, that the public interest would not be served by its publication either here or in the United States, and that such publication is wholly unnecessary to enable a just opinion to be formed on the only point on which fault has been officially found with Sir A. Swettenham, viz., the propriety of his letter.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies if the Government have knowledge of any reasons which prompted Sir Alexander Swettenham to dispense with the services of the contingent landed by Admiral Davis other than those published in his letter to the Admiral; and, if so, whether he will state them.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The Government believe they are in possession of all the material facts, but the propriety of Sir Alexander Swettenham's action in dispensing with the services of the contingent has not been called in question, and no useful purpose, but the reverse, would be served by setting forth the reasons for it.

Sir GILBERT PARKER: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, in view of further information received as to the privacy of the letter addressed by Sir Alexander Swettenham to Admiral Davis, and that a private letter of the kind should not have been published without permission, and that this Government had not requisite knowledge of all the facts when it administered its rebuke to Sir Alexander Swettenham on 22nd January, whether it can see its way to make due apology and reparation to him.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The Answer is in the negative.

Mr. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the three telegrams, Nos. 2, 3, and 4, of the published correspondence, are the only official communications received by the Colonial Office from the Governor of Jamaica relative to the letters which passed between him and Rear-Admiral Davis; and if the telegram No. 2 contained any explanation of the letters.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Further official communications have been received from Sir A. Swettenham with regard to the correspondence between himself and Admiral Davis, but His Majesty's Government have decided that it would be contrary to the public interest to publish any further Papers.

Mr. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if the Colonial Office will place before the House the message sent by Admiral Davis to his superior officer, Admiral Evans, relating to Sir A. Swettenham.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The question of publishing a report from one officer in the United States Service to another officer of that service is obviously a matter which does not fall within the province of His Majesty's Government.

MR. REMNANT: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the letter has already been published in the newspapers?

MR. CHURCHILL: It is not the practice of the Government of this country to publish as official Papers what is published in newspapers.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley), calling the right hon. Gentleman's attention to the fact that the letter he was now asked to publish absolutely exonerated Sir A. Swettenham from the charge brought against him, asked whether, in justice to this House and for the honour of the country, he would not publish that letter.

MR. CHURCHILL did not see how the honour of the country and the House of Commons was involved in the question whether there should be published as an official Paper a letter already made public in many newspapers.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked if it was not the case that the Government originally took action upon a letter published in the newspapers.

MR. CHURCHILL: No action was taken upon a newspaper publication except in the event of that publication being accepted and endorsed by Sir A. Swettenham.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Do hon. Gentlemen above the gangway want to get up a war with the United States?

MR. BRIDGEMAN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if His Majesty's Government are in possession of a copy of Rear-Admiral Davis's answer to the letter from the mayor of Kingston; and, if so, whether they will publish it.

MR. CHURCHILL: The correspondence was published in the *Jamaica Gleaner* of the 19th January. There appears to be no reason for re-publishing it.

MR. BRIDGEMAN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will say whether the letters published in [Cd. 3403] between Rear-Admiral Davis and Sir A. Swettenham were official communications; and whether he has any official information showing by whom they were communicated to the Press.

MR. CHURCHILL: Correspondence passing between the Governor of a British Colony and the Admiral of a foreign fleet upon matters of public importance lying wholly within the scope of their respective official duties, is necessarily official correspondence in the strictest sense, and cannot be divested of its official character by any informality in expression. The Answer to the second part of the Question is in the negative.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, in reference to the Papers recently presented, whether Sir Alexander Swettenham was requested by the Colonial Office to withdraw his resignation; and, if so, on what grounds the request was made.

MR. CHURCHILL: Sir Alexander Swettenham was not requested to withdraw his resignation, but was given the opportunity of doing so if he wished. He preferred not to withdraw it.

Chinese Coolies in the Transvaal.

MR. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the total number of Chinese indentured labourers in the Transvaal at the present time; and what number have arrived since 1st January of this year.

MR. CHURCHILL: The number of Chinese coolies employed on the 31st of March was, according to a telegram received through Reuter's agency, 53,651. About 2,000 were imported early in January, since when there have been and there will be no further importations.

Education of Coolie Children in Ceylon.

SIR C. SCHWANN (Manchester, N): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what is the present position in Ceylon with regard to the education of children in that Colony, especially with reference to elementary education of coolie children on the tea plantations in estate schools and otherwise.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The draft ordinance for extending educational facilities in the rural and planting districts of Ceylon has, I understand, been read a second time in the Ceylon Legislature and referred to a Committee of that body.

British Indian Storekeepers in Natal.

Sir C. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been drawn to the further refusals by the licensing officer, under the Dealers' Licensing Act of that Colony, to renew the shop licences of the British-Indian storekeepers of Natal, Ismail Saley Mahomed, storekeeper, of Harding, Natal, established eleven years, T. Mahomed, Ghouse, and Company, of Pietermaritzburg, Natal, established eighteen years, Shaboodeen, of Pietermaritzburg, Natal, established twenty-five years, M. K. Pillay, of Pietermaritzburg, Natal, established several years; and whether he will make further representations to the Natal Government calling attention to the manner in which the Act is being administered.

Mr. CHURCHILL: No official information has been received, though I have seen one of the cases reported in the Press. In this case the refusal to issue the licence was, I understand, withdrawn. Inquiry shall be made.

Turkish Customs Duty.

Mr. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs when the House will be given an opportunity of discussing the increase in the Turkish Customs Duty to which the British Government have consented.

The SECRETARY of STATE for FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir Edward Grey, Northumberland, Berwick): Very full Papers will be laid before Parliament, and will, of course, be available for debate on the usual opportunities.

Mr. ASHLEY: Can the right hon. Baronet say approximately when Papers will be laid?

Sir EDWARD GREY: They are being got ready as quickly as possible.

The Assouan Dam.

Mr. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the contract for the proposed raising of the Assouan Dam, by over twenty-five feet, will be put out to public tender; and, if not, can he state to the House how this work is to be carried out.

Sir EDWARD GREY: An offer from Messrs. Aird to raise the dam for £E1,037,000 has been accepted.

Mr. ASHLEY: Is this money to be provided out of the revenue of Egypt?

[No Answer was returned.]

Mr. BOWLES: Was this the only offer received, or was an opportunity afforded to other firms to undertake the work?

Sir EDWARD GREY: I will make inquiries as to that.

Mr. BOWLES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any correspondence has passed between the Foreign Office and Lord Cromer as to the allocation of the contract for the proposed heightening of the Assouan Dam; and, if so, whether he can lay that correspondence upon the Table or state its purport to the House.

Sir EDWARD GREY: No correspondence regarding the allocation of the contract has passed with Lord Cromer, with the exception of a telegram stating that Messrs. Aird's offer has been accepted.

Sequel to the Denshawai Incident.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will state under what law the Egyptian Government continues to penalise the entire population of the village of Denshawai by mulcting them in heavily increased payments for village watchmen, and by refusing to allow any inhabitant to commute military service by payment, besides degrading the village by making it technically subordinate to another of less size.

Sir EDWARD GREY: I am not aware that any special law was enacted or required for these matters, which seem to be purely administrative, and I have nothing to add to the Answers previously given on this Question.

Egyptian Date Tree Tax.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Legislative Council of Egypt has repeatedly urged on the Egyptian Government the expedience of abolishing the tax on date trees; whether he is aware that cultivators have not only to pay the tax on the trees but the tax on the land on which they grow, and which is necessarily withdrawn from other cultivation, while orchards are free of tax; and, seeing that the tax on date trees is thus restrictive of production of food and useful material which Egypt could easily produce, and which has now to be imported, whether he will instruct the British Agency to advise the Egyptian Government to abolish it.

SIR EDWARD GREY: As has already been stated, the question of the date tax is to be more fully studied by the Egyptian Government in the current year. The fiscal policy is in favour of lessening the burden of taxation generally wherever possible. But, in view of difficulties of detail and of necessities of revenue, it is impossible for the Egyptian Government to give any pledge as to how this particular tax can be dealt with.

MR. ASHLEY: May I ask if it is not the fact that even after the land tax and date tax have been paid the capital invested in the date tree cultivation in Egypt pays the not inconsiderable dividend of from 9 to 12 per cent.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I must ask for notice of that.

Factory Legislation in Egypt.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, with reference to the Answer given by him to a Question asked on the 4th December, 1906,† whether it is not in the power of the Egyptian Government to obtain from the Court of Appeal of the mixed tribunals power to apply factory legislation to Europeans, provided that the punishment for infraction does not exceed *les peines de simple police;* and whether, having regard to this fact, he will advise the Egyptian Government to introduce legislation regulating the hours of labour, fencing of machinery, and sanitary conditions, in factories and mines.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have had a report on this subject since the Question referred to in December, and am informed that a Factory Act, however desirable, would require the assent of fifteen different Powers, which it would practically be impossible to obtain. I will make inquiry as to the statement contained in the first part of the Question.

Sunderland Death by Blood Poisoning.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is yet in a position to report the result of his investigations in regard to the death of Ann Wilson at Sunderland through blood-poisoning, alleged to have been set up through the dressing used by manufacturers in the making of calico.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): As I have just informed the hon. Member, I obtained a piece of the calico and had it subjected to analysis by an expert, who, after various experiments, reported that it was free from pathogenic organisms, the organisms found being both common contaminations of any material which is exposed to air.

Vaccination Case at Romsey.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the case of Mr. G. Reeves, of Castle Lane Farm, Chilworth, near Romsey, Hampshire, who was summoned under the Vaccination Acts, threatened with a warrant because he did not appear, and, when he did appear, charged 8s. for a warrant which was not issued; and whether he proposes to take steps to prevent such action by magistrates in vaccination cases.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have made inquiry in this case and find that the defendant was summoned, that he did not obey the summons, and told the officer who served it that he did not intend to appear, that he was then warned that a warrant for his arrest might be issued, and that on his still failing to appear a warrant was accordingly made out and signed. Later in the day, when the Court was over, he appeared, and out of consideration for him the Justices who were present heard the case. He was not ordered to pay the fee chargeable in respect of the warrant. There is no occasion for any action on my part.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxvi., 747.

Mr. LUPTON: Is it necessary for a defendant to appear in these cases?

Mr. GLADSTONE was understood to reply that the Bench had the power to insist on attendance.

Railway Rates for Horticultural Produce.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the dissatisfaction which exists in the fruit and vegetable trades with regard to the excessive rates charged by railway companies on such goods; and if, in view of the fact that these rates were originally framed when this traffic was much smaller than it is to-day, he will take steps to bring about a reclassification of the existing rates.

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE (Mr. Lloyd-George, Carnarvon Boroughs): Complaints of this nature were brought to my notice some months ago by a deputation of traders who undertook to supply me with a statement of facts giving particular instances of the grievances in question. They have not yet supplied me with these facts, but when they do so I will gladly endeavour to bring about a conference between the representatives of the traders and the railway companies to discuss the matter.

Protection against the Sea at Spurn Point.

Mr. STANLEY WILSON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he intends to have the seabank running from Easington to Kilnsea, in East Yorkshire, reconstructed during the summer in order to prevent the flooding of the low-lying lands in that district which takes place at every abnormal tide; and whether he is aware that unless this is done the road, which is the only means of communication with the Spurn and Kilnsea village, will be destroyed; and that there is also the danger of the sea breaking through this neck of land and joining with the Humber.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: The maintenance of seabanks for the protection of the low lands of Kilnsea and Easington is a duty devolving not upon the Government but upon the owners of the land liable to be flooded and upon the Commissioners of Sewers for the east parts of the East Riding of Yorkshire. I understand that the Commissioners are considering the construction of a short seabank across the narrowest portion of the Kilnsea low level to prevent the flooding of a considerable portion of the area referred to. The Government in 1903 offered a contribution of £400 towards the construction of a bank which the Commissioners proposed at that time to make, as it was considered that it would assist in protecting the road to the Spurn Point works and the coastguard station, but that bank has not been proceeded with. The Commissioners have recently applied to the Government to renew their offer of £400 in connection with the work now proposed on the ground that it will protect the road. The matter is now under consideration.

German Steamship Competition for Australasian Trade.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been directed to the intention of two German steamship lines to endeavour to capture the British carrying trade between New York and Australasia; and in such case, if he will take advantage of the presence in this country of the Imperial statesmen from Greater Britain to confer with them as to the best means of counteracting an enterprise calculated to involve a rate war unfavourable to the manufacturers and artisans of this country.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: I have seen statements to the general effect indicated in the first part of the Question. As to the last part I can only say that various matters affecting British and Foreign shipping will come up for discussion at the Imperial Conference now sitting.

Smallpox in Germany.

Mr. LUPTON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the epidemic of smallpox in Germany and the probable derivation of vaccine from variolous matter in that country, he will take steps to prohibit the importation of vaccine from the Continent into England during such time as the epidemic may continue.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): I have no information as to there being an epidemic of smallpox in Germany, though I am aware that there has been some prevalence of the disease on the frontier at Metz. I have no authority to prohibit the importation of lymph from the Continent, and I may add that I understand that any vaccine of variolous origin which is current in Germany and which is liable to be imported into this country would have been frequently passed through the calf.

MR. LUPTON: Is not Metz in Germany?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Yes.

MR. LUPTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman send a Commission to inquire into the facts?

[No Answer was given.]

Vaccination Bill.

MR. LUPTON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board at what date he proposes to introduce the Vaccination Bill.

MR. JOHN BURNS: To-day, Sir.

Vaccine Used at Metz.

MR. LUPTON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he will ascertain whether the vaccine made in Germany for general consumption is derived from matter of variolous origin, as reported by Dr. Kelsch recently to the Académie Médicale of Paris: and, if so, whether he has any official information showing that the use of such vaccine in Metz accounted in part for the outbreak of smallpox in that city and neighbourhood.

MR. BURNS: My attention has not been drawn to any such Report by Dr. Kelsch as is referred to in the Question. It does not appear to me to be necessary to make inquiry as to the vaccine made in Germany for general consumption. The Answer to the last part of the Question is in the negative.

House Drainage Regulations in London.

MR. T. DAVIES (Fulham): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware of the expense imposed upon sanitary authorities in regard to combined drainage, to some extent as the result of the decision of the Court of Appeal (Silles *v.* Fulham Borough Council); whether he is aware that the cost to the ratepayers of London alone is over £40,000 per annum to maintain such drains, and in view of that will he bring in a Bill to amend the law, so that dishonest builders and houseowners are no longer able surreptitiously to connect the drains of two or more houses, thereby to throw the cost of maintaining purely private drainage from their own shoulders to those of the ratepayers; and, if he is not prepared to bring in a Bill himself, will he give his support to a Bill if brought in by a private Member on behalf of the Metropolitan borough councils.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I have received representations to the effect stated in the Question. The subject is one of difficulty, and I could not give any pledge to propose legislation with regard to it this session. I am ready to consider any measure which may be introduced on behalf of the borough councils for dealing with the matter, but, of course, I could not say beforehand that the Bill will be one which I could support.

Irish Poor Law Officers and the Census Returns.

MR. MEAGHER (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether applications have been made to the Royal Commission on Poor Laws by Irish Poor Law officers for payment for the work entailed in the preparation of the Census Returns required by them in the year 1906; whether he will see his way to recommend payment to those officers who requested it at the time they were furnishing the information; and whether, in the event of further information being required by the Commission in any part of the United Kingdom, provision will be made for remuneration to the officers affected.

MR. JOHN BURNS: I understand that applications of the kind referred to have been made to the Royal Commission.

It would not come within my province to make recommendations to the Commission with regard to Irish Poor Law officers; but I am informed that the Commission are not at present able to say that further information may not be called for by them, and that they have deferred the question of any remuneration until this has been ascertained.

Bournville Postmen's Sunday Duty Pay.

MR. T. F. RICHARDS: I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that men are employed doing postmen's work on Sundays at Bournville and are only paid 4d. per hour; and whether he will take steps to see that proper payment is made for these duties.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The established and auxiliary postmen at Bournville are paid at the authorised scale rates for Sunday duty which, at their present wages, are 9d. an hour and 8d. an hour respectively, and the man who is employed on alternate Sundays as substitute for the established postman is paid 2s. for a duty of three and a quarter hours. On Sunday the 24th ultimo it was necessary to obtain assistance to deliver a large batch of election circulars, and the ordinary rate authorised for outdoor Sunday overtime work performed by sub-postmasters' assistants, namely, 4d. an hour, was paid.

Training of Students in Foreign Languages.

MR. MACLEAN (Bath): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he can state how many students from training colleges have been sent to France and Germany for special training in foreign languages, and how many of such students have utilised their knowledge so gained by being subsequently employed in schools where foreign languages are taught.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. MCKENNA, Monmouthshire, N.): During the last ten years seventy-one men and 204 women have been granted a third year of training abroad. Of these thirty-three men and 179 women proceeded to France, and twenty-nine men and two women to Germany. The remaining thirty-two students applied during the current year, and the Board have not yet been informed in which country the training will be taken. The Board have no information as to the second part of my hon. friend's Question.

Rifle Shooting in Hartlepool School.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education if he is yet in a position to report the result of his inquiries as to the teaching of rifle shooting at Halley's Field Upper Standard School, Hartlepool.

MR. MCKENNA: I have made inquiries as to the incidents to which my hon. friend refers. I find that targets have been exhibited in the corrider of the school, but not in the class-rooms. So far as can be ascertained, no instruction in rifle-shooting or sighting has been given in school hours and no boy has ever been reprimanded in school for being absent from such instruction. My hon. friend is doubtless aware that the use to which the school premises may be put out of school hours, rests not with the Board of Education, but with the local education authority.

MR. SUMMERBELL: Is it not the fact that the inspector only made inquiries of the schoolmaster who was responsible for allowing the targets to be placed there?

MR. MCKENNA: I will inquire as to that.

School Nomenclature.

MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in the compilation of the new official list of public elementary schools in the revised nomenclature of non-provided schools, he has adopted the principle of omitting the epithet Church of England, National, or British, and simply associated the title of the school with the village or township in single-school areas.

MR. MCKENNA: The epithets National and British have been universally omitted. Church of England has been allowed in cases where the managers have applied for it, but only when that epithet or National formed part of the name of the school before. Owing to the possibility of confusion subsequently arising and to the difficulty of determining which of several thousands can properly be regarded as justifying special treatment, it has not, as I had previously hoped, been found possible to differentiate between single school areas and other areas. Moreover, I think with my right hon. predecessor that there is much to be said in favour of a name which gives clear information to parents as to the character of religious teaching which their children would receive if they attended the school.

* MR. CLOUGH: Arising out of that Answer, may I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he considers that this wholesale conversion of non-provided schools into flagrantly denominational schools is consistent with the reply given by his predecessor on 20th December last on the same subject to the effect that "in the great majority of cases the excision of the word 'national'——

* MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is violating two Rules, first he is asking as to a matter of opinion, and secondly he is quoting a former Answer.

*MR. CLOUGH: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether in the cases of Bracewell, Cold Coniston, Easington Dale Head, Garsdale, Grassington, Kildwick, Rathmell, Salterforth, Settle, and Thornton-in-Lonsdale, all single school areas in the Skipton division, the epithet Church of England has been substituted for National; whether these changes have been made at the suggestion of properly-convened boards of managers in every instance; whether the views of the local education authority with regard to each of these changes in nomenclature have always been ascertained; and will he state why the principle of omitting the epithet National and simply associating the titles of the schools with the respective villages or townships in these ten single school areas has not been adopted.

MR. McKENNA: The Answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The names proposed have been notified to the Board by the official correspondents, and the Board cannot but assume that they represent the views of the managers. The managers were requested in each case to forward a copy of their suggestion to the local education authority in order that that body might have an opportunity of submitting any observations on the names proposed by the managers. I have already dealt in the Answer which I have just given with the last paragraph of my hon. friend's Question.

Cowper-Temple Clause.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether the repeal of Section 16 of the Education Act of 1870 by the Education Act of 1902 has the effect of depriving the Board of Education of any power to interfere in the case of infringements of the Cowper-Temple clause by local education authorities; and, if so, what remedy is provided for such infringement.

MR. McKENNA: The repeal of Section 16 deprives the Board of Education of the power to decide what constitutes an infringement of the Cowper-Temple clause, and they have, therefore, now no authority to interfere unless and until a competent Court has decided that a local education authority has contravened the statute. The remedy would seem to lie either in an application to the auditor to disallow any items of expenditure which may have been incurred in the giving of instruction prohibited by the Cowper-Temple clause or in an application to the Court for an injunction.

State Mineral Rights.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether any mining companies have ever entered into negotiations with his Department before extending mining operations below low-water mark, in recognition of the right of the State to minerals thus extracted; and, if so, to what extent has this been done.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): Minerals under the sea belong to Crown and are under the management of the Commissioners of Woods. It is the usual course for persons desiring to carry on mining operations under the sea to apply to the Commissioners for a lease, and many such leases have been granted reserving rents and royalties to the Crown.

Income-Tax Incidence.

MR. WILES (Islington, S.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if, on his rearrangement of the incidence of the income-tax, he will provide that small shareholders in private limited companies, who are also employees of the said companies and receive shares and dividend as part of their remuneration, shall pay income-tax on the lower scale.

MR. RUNCIMAN: My right hon. friend will not fail to bear in mind my hon. friend's suggestion, but the matter is not free from difficulty.

Whitburn Beach, Sunderland.

MR. SUMMERBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can say whether the Harton Coal Company have abated the nuisance of tipping slag, firebrick, and cinders on to the beach at Whitburn, near Sunderland; and, if not, whether he will take action in regard to the same.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I am informed that tipping on the beach will be discontinued in about a month's time.

Agricultural Instruction.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether the Departmental Committee appointed to report on the provision of technical classes in agriculture for England will, before reporting, inspect the work of the kind now being carried on in Ireland under the Irish Agricultural and Technical Department.

THE TREASURER OF THE HOUSEHOLD, (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somerset, S.): We shall be happy to bring the suggestion of the hon. Member to the notice of the Chairman of the Committee, who will, I am sure, give it careful consideration.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Is the hon. baronet aware that the Irish Agricultural Department has proved of little or no practical benefit to Irish farmers?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I am not aware of that.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Is the hon. baronet aware that I live in the heart of an agricultural district in Ireland and can speak with personal knowledge?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: The hon. Gentleman misunderstands me; my answer should have been that I have no official knowledge.

MR. BARRIE: I beg to direct the hon. baronet's attention to the Report of the Department just issued for last year.

Irish Land Purchase Finance.

MR. P. A. MCHUGH (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state in detail the calculations from which the sum of £1,506 19s. 7d., deducted in respect of land purchase from grants payable to the county council of Sligo, was arrived at, also the calculations on which the sum of £66 17s. 5d. was directly deducted from the share of the Sligo urban district, and the sum of £79 from the share of the guardians of Sligo union; will full particulars of all deductions from grants be furnished to all public bodies concerned; is he aware that Sligo borough is one of the corporate towns in Ireland in which the rating powers of the municipal councils are limited by local Acts; and can he state the amount of the deductions in the other corporate towns similarly situated.

I beg also to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, in regard to the £70,996 deducted in respect of land purchase transactions from grants to public bodies in Ireland, how much of that sum has been deducted in the case of each of the county boroughs Dublin, Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Belfast, and Londonderry, and how much in the case of each of the non-county boroughs Kilkenny, Drogheda, Wexford, Clonmel, and Sligo.

I beg further to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the sums of £66 17s. 5d. and £79, deducted from the grants payable to the Sligo Corporation and to the Sligo board of guardians in respect of the urban district respectively, are included in the sum of £1,506 deducted from the grants payable to Sligo county council; whether the borough of Sligo, being under its local

Act responsible for a portion of the county-at-large charges, is bound to make good its portion of this £1,506; whether the average yearly contribution to the Corporation of Sligo from the Local Taxation Account was, for the five years ended 31st March, 1906, only £170; and can he say how much of the Local Taxation Grant will be payable to the corporation for the year 1906–7 after deducting the sums chargeable against it for losses in connection with land purchase.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): My hon. friend has asked me to answer this and the two following Questions. The answers are necessarily of considerable length and include tabular statements. It would be more convenient to circulate printed answers with the Votes,† and with the hon. Member's permission I will adopt that course.

Cork and the Guarantee Fund.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state on what estate or estates in Cork county the sum of £831 arrears of purchase annuities which have been deducted from the Guarantee Fund have accrued; how much of these arrears have been paid up since the 31st January, 1907; how is the sum of £4,050, also deducted from the county share of the fund, arrived at; whether adequate particulars with full details of these stoppages are furnished to the respective councils; and what means, if any, do the county councils possess for testing the correctness of the Treasury deductions.

MR. BIRRELL: My hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. For the purpose of computing the arrears to be drawn from the Guarantee Fund reference is made solely to the deficiency of each county as a whole, and not to the various estates within the county. The hon. Member will, however, find in the Annual Report of the Land Commission for 1906, at page 144, a table giving particulars of the case of every tenant purchaser then one year and upwards in arrear. Out of the arrear of £831 mentioned in the Question, the sum of £544 14s. 8d. has since been paid. The Answer to the remainder of the Question includes a tabular statement, and with the hon. Member's permission I will furnish a full Answer with the Votes.‡

MR. FLYNN: If the arrears only amount to the small sum of £831, of which £544 has since been paid, why are the ratepayers of the county to be debited in advance by one-third, when the sum has been almost all recovered?

MR. BIRRELL: I think the hon. Member will find the Answer to that in the Answer I have promised to circulate to another Question.

Foreign Trawlers in the Moray Firth.

MR. STANLEY WILSON: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland how many foreign trawlers other than Norwegian, recently reported to have been seen trawling in the Moray Firth, have been examined by the Scottish authorities; and whether any English fishermen have been found on board.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): Only one foreign trawler, other than Norwegian, has been observed during the last fortnight, and no English fishermen were reported to be on board.

Inspection of Scottish Dairies.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will grant a Return of the number of local authorities who have, and of those who have not, appointed veterinary surgeons to carry out the provisions contained in Sections 43 and 60 of The Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897, and in Article 3 of the Dairies, Cowsheds, and Milkshops Order of 1899.

MR. SINCLAIR: I am informed that all the burghal and ninety-seven out of a total number of 107 county authorities have approved the employment of veterinary surgeons for the purposes of Section 43 of The Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will grant a Return for each of the years 1905 and 1906 of the number of inspections made by approved veterinary surgeons in terms of Section 60 (1) and (2), respectively, of The Public Health (Scotland) Act, 1897.

---

† See cols. 667–8.

‡ See col. 669.

MR. SINCLAIR: The Returns for 1906 are as yet incomplete. In 1905 twenty-three inspections were made in terms of Section 60 (1), and eighteen in terms of Section 60 (2).

West Clare Evicted Tenants.

MR. HALPIN (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of evicted tenants reinstated in West Clare, especially on the Vandeleur estate, who have received instalments to help them to till their farms, and also the number that have not received instalments; and whether he will use his influence with the Estates Commissioners to give immediate assistance to those who have not received advancements, in order to help them to till their land.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that sixty-two evicted tenants have been reinstated in county Clare. Of these thirty have been reinstated on the Vandeleur estate, and the Commissioners have already sanctioned grants, amounting in all to £2,618, to some twenty-five of the latter tenants. The Commissioners appear to be doing all that can be done in the matter, but in any event I could not interfere with their discretion in such cases.

Irish Lunacy Expenditure.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, whether he can state what was the amount of money expended in the year 1906 on lunatic asylums in Ireland; what portion of the sum went to the upkeep of the inmates and what was the amount for administration; and can he also state what was the sum expended in the same year on the poorhouses in Ireland, differentiating in the same way between inmates and administration.

MR. BIRRELL: The expenditure upon lunatic asylums for the year ending 31st March, 1906, cannot yet be stated, as the audit for that year has not been completed. It will not be possible to differentiate between the expenditure upon inmates and administration, for though the accounts will show the expenditure on salaries and pensions, they will not show the outlay upon food, etc., for the inmates and staff separately. The total expenditure of boards of guardians for the same year was £1,285,989. Of this amount £460,016 was for in-maintenance; £228,870 for out-relief, and £196,709 for salaries and rations. The balance fell under various heads.

MR. JOYCE: When may we expect to have the accounts?

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed there will be no great delay.

Ballaghaline Pier.

MR. HALPIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in accordance with his hope to introduce a Bill at an early date, he will introduce a Bill to enable the Clare County Council to avail themselves of the money allocated to be spent on the fishing pier at Ballaghaline, county Clare, so as to enable the work to be proceeded with early in the summer.

MR. BIRRELL: I had hoped to introduce before now a Bill for extending the power of local authorities to contribute to works of the nature referred to in the Question. Differences, however, have arisen between the Department of Agriculture and the Board of Works as to the authority to be charged with the execution of works to the cost of which the Department may contribute, and in the circumstances the introduction of the Bill has been unavoidably delayed. The matter is still the subject of negotiations.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman bear in mind that the money for this pier was allocated seven years ago, that the delay in going on with the work is due simply to a technical difficulty, and in view of the fact that work is urgently needed by the poor fishermen in the district, will he see that the money is allowed to be spent this year?

MR. BIRRELL: I will do my best.

Wandesforde Castlecomer Estate.

MR. MEAGHER: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that purchase agreements have been signed by a majority of tenants on the Wandesforde Castlecomer estate, and that a number of the tenants, though signing, have expressed requests to have their farms inspected by the Estates Commissioners so that the Government may be able to see the value of the holdings before the money is advanced; and whether the Estates Commissioners will see that these requests are acceded to, and will, on visiting the estate, take into consideration the case of those tenants who have not as yet signed but are anxious to buy on terms fixed by the Estates Commissioners.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the majority of the purchase agreements in this case were lodged in February, 1907. Before advances are made the holdings will be inspected in all cases not within the zones, and the holdings of the tenants who have not signed agreements to purchase will also be inspected, in order that the Commissioners may be in a position to decide whether the action of those tenants was reasonable.

Irish Government Credit Balances.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer how much has been received as interest on the credit balances of the Irish Government Departments, and upon moneys placed on deposit by them, under the arrangements made by his predecessor up to the 31st March, 1907, and to what purposes has this interest been devoted; and if he will consider the question of utilising the interest received upon these moneys to assist the financing of the Land Purchase (Ireland) Act of 1903.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Mr. ASQUITH): I am informed that the sums received as interest for the year ended the 31st March, 1907, on the balances of Government money on deposit account at the Bank of Ireland amounted to a total of £21,695. These interest payments were carried to credit of the various acounts on which they arose. A sum of £11,406, more than half the total, arose on the Separate Credits Account of the Irish Land Commission and was applied for the benefit of the separate estates concerned therein. The remainder accrued to the Ireland Development Grant, the Local Taxation Account, and the accounts of the Department of Agriculture and other Departments in Ireland. It would not be possible to divert these receipts from the accounts to which they respectively belong and to apply them in financing Irish Land Purchase.

Irish Poor Law Reform.

MR. BARRIE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when he intends to introduce the Government proposals for Poor Law reform in Ireland.

MR. BIRRELL: I beg to refer to the Answer which I gave to a similar Question put by the hon. Member for North Kilkenny on the 5th of last month, namely, the Government deem it necessary to consider carefully the recommendations of the Viceregal Commission as a whole before undertaking the necessary legislation to give effect to them. This will occupy a considerable time, and I am therefore not in a position to make any definite statement in the matter.

Irish Civil Service.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether a clerk in one of the Dublin Castle offices, who applied some time ago for an increase of salary, as allowed by the Civil Service rules, was, at the suggestion of Sir Robert Holmes, removed from the work on which he was engaged and replaced by a clerk of longer service; whether he will consider, in conjunction with the facts recently placed before him, the contrast afforded by this case and the cases of Sir Robert's personal clerks, who were, at the time of their promotions, and would still be, in the ordinary course of things, very junior members of their respective classes; and whether he will further consider what weight, if any, should be given to any further representations made by Sir Robert Holmes to the Treasury in cases such as these.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I must refer the hon. Member to the reply which I gave him on the 23rd instant.†

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 1577.

Irish Court of Judicature Investments.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, with reference to the Return just issued by him showing receipts and payments of the Accountant-General of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland, whether he can state the average rate of interest on the securities in which the funds of suitors in the said court are invested; what is the rate of dividend paid on each £100 invested in Bristol Corporation, Chinese Bonds, East Argentine Railway Company, and St. Louis Breweries, Limited; is he aware that municipal corporations in Ireland pay to the Treasury 4¼ per cent. interest on money borrowed for the construction of waterworks and for other sanitary purposes; and, seeing that the funds of suitors in the said court amount to over £6,000,000 sterling, can he say whether an arrangement could be made under which some of the funds could be loaned to sanitary authorities in Ireland at 3 to 4 per cent., so as, without danger of loss to the funds, to effect a saving in local rates, and enable sanitary authorities to carry out improvements in the housing of the working classes and in other respects.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: I learn that the average rate of interest received on securities held by the Accountant-General on behalf of the suitors of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland is £2 17s. 3d. per cent. free of income-tax. No funds have ever been invested by the Accountant-General in any of the particular securities referred to in the Question. So far as they are held they have in each case been transferred into court by or on behalf of suitors. Loans out of the Local Loans Fund to local authorities in Ireland, or in Great Britain, are charged 4¼ per cent. when the period exceeds forty years. Such loans would clearly not be a suitable investment for funds in court. The securities in which these funds may be invested are prescribed by the rules of the Supreme Court. Local Loans Stock is included among the securities so prescribed.

Ballingarry Postmistress.

Mr. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the 18th March last Mrs. Scriven, postmistress at Ballingarry, returned to the General Post Office, Dublin, a letter addressed to herself, marking it refused; whether, when the writ therein contained was posted a second time, it was returned again marked refused; whether he will inquire into the character of this official and the nature of her civil obligations for debt; and whether he will ascertain how the assailants of the postman who was carrying the letters through Gortnahoctee, on the 19th March, were made aware that some of those letters contained processes for debt.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: The sub-postmistress of Ballingarry did refuse to accept a letter addressed to herself, and she was quite at liberty to do so. She bears a good official character and I see no reason for making any inquiry into the nature of her civil obligations. I have not been able to ascertain how the assailants of the postman at Gortnahoctee became aware of the nature of the contents of the letters, but I can find no reason for believing that information on the subject was divulged by any Post Office servant.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): Will the Prime Minister state what Supply will be taken on Thursday?

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs) said that the Supply which it was proposed to take on Thursday was, first, the Vote for the Dublin Police Force, then the Vote for the Public Works Office (Ireland), and afterwards the Vote for the Local Government Board.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: When will the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill be taken in Committee?

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I can give no indication as to that.

SCOTTISH STANDING COMMITTEE.

Sir HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) called attention to a notice which he had received in common, he supposed, with other

Members for Scottish constituencies from the Committee of Selection stating that "the Committee of Selection have nominated you a Member of the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills." He thought it would be agreed that there was some irregularity in such a notice.

*MR. SPEAKER said he did not think the use of the word "nominated" in the notice was quite correct. The House by a Standing Order had previously appointed every Scottish Member to sit upon the Scottish Committee. The Report of the Committee of Selection which appeared on 25th April stated that "the following Members representing Scottish constituencies are appointed to serve on the Standing Committee." That seemed to him to be a correct expression, and he had no doubt that on another occasion a somewhat similar form would be adopted in the notice summoning Members.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.) as chairman of the Committee of Selection, expressed regret that the form of notice to which exception had been taken had been used. The head in the Votes delivered on Friday morning was so framed as to make it clear that the Committee was appointed by the House, and not selected by the Committee of Selection, and he regretted that in sending out the usual notification the old form of summons had been issued instead of the proper notification.

NEW BILL.

VACCINATION BILL.

"To substitute a statutory declaration for the certificate required under Section 2 of The Vaccination Act, 1898, of conscientious objection," presented by Mr. John Burns; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 172.]

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [29th April], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Sir Henry Craik.

Which Amendment was—

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House welcomes State action to promote small holdings; but, supporting the principle of responsible ownership in land, it believes that the Government policy should be based on purchase, and deprecates the extension of an extreme form of divided ownership to districts beyond those crofter areas where the occupier provides equipment' instead thereof."—(*Mr. Munro Ferguson.*)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.), continuing his speech, said that when the debate was adjourned he was alluding to the speech delivered by the Lord Advocate on the Motion for the First Reading of the Bill, when the right hon. Gentleman advanced as one of his reasons for supporting the Bill that it would, once and for all, put an end to arbitrary evictions. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman in the course of his reply on the present occasion to point out on what official statistics that sweeping charge rested. Further, he would ask that those statistics should be of a recent character and not antiquated Returns, and that the right hon. Gentleman should not be guided by the precedent set up by his chief (the Prime Minister) in the matter, who seemed to think that statistics were like wine—all the better for having been kept for some time. That right hon. Gentleman seemed to prefer the vintage of 1895 to that of 1906, which he thought contained a sounder wine. He also hoped that if the right hon. Gentleman gave them this information he would not be satisfied with single and isolated cases of eviction, but would consider that in Scotland, according to his own Return, there were 62,900 holdings under £50 a year, and would realise that to establish a case against the landlords of Scotland it would be necessary to show that in the last five years a considerable percentage of the tenants of these holdings had been evicted for arbitrary and capricious reasons. There must be some kind of arbitrary eviction frequently taking place in Scotland to make a Bill of such a drastic character necessary, and not merely such evictions as were treated as reasonable under the Bill now under consideration.

THE LORD-ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs) denied having made any statement to the effect that there had been arbitrary evictions in Scotland on a wholesale scale; on the contrary, he had expressly stated that the power of arbitrary eviction was one which, in the case of the landlords of Scotland, had not been exercised. The right hon. Gentleman cited *The Parliamentary Debates* in support of his statement.

*MR. COCHRANE said he was glad the right hon. Gentleman had somewhat qualified what he and others around him understood him to have said. But if the right hon. Gentleman would carry his mind further back he would see that the statements he had made were mixed up with a general charge against dukes and earls. He hoped that for the credit of the right hon. Gentleman it would not be necessary for him to include the name of the Earl of Portsmouth amongst these.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): My right hon. friend has read the words he used, in which he said this power of arbitrary eviction——

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I rise to order, Sir. Is the right hon. Gentleman in order? So long as the Lord-Advocate made his rather long interruption as a personal explanation it was all right, but if the Prime Minister is going to come to this defence——

*MR. SPEAKER: I understood the Prime Minister to rise in consequence of something which fell from the hon. Member for North Ayrshire.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Then I apologise.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My right hon. friend having quoted the words he used, which were a flat contradiction of what the hon. Member attributed to him, all the hon. Member says is that he is glad he has given my right hon. friend an opportunity of modifying the allegation he had made. That is not enough.

*MR. COCHRANE said the reproof which the Prime Minister had administered would have fallen with greater severity if he had happened to hear the original speech of the Lord Advocate.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I was here.

*MR. COCHRANE assured the right hon. Gentleman he was mistaken in saying he was present on that occasion, and unfortunately, therefore, had not the opportunity which he had of listening to that particular speech. He was quite satisfied to take the attitude of the Government not from his interpretation of that speech or from the impression left upon his mind and the minds of his hon. friends by it, but from the words of Lord Carrington to the Scottish Chambers of Agriculture. That noble Lord, in giving his version of the situation, said—

> "He would never deny that with the case of the great majority of large estates in Scotland arbitrary evictions did not take place."

If, therefore, he had unjustly attributed certain views to the right hon. Gentleman the Lord Advocate, it was now perfectly clear that the arbitrary evictions did not occur, and therefore they could not be advanced as a reason in favour of passing this Bill. He was sorry to have dealt at such length with what, after all, were minor points. He would now draw attention to another speech delivered the same day by the right hon. Gentleman the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, who proposed what seemed to be a somewhat wiser and saner policy for dealing with the land question than that proposed by the Secretary for Scotland. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Government proposed to introduce a Land Bill dealing with the question of small holdings in England—

> "They were all agreed that they did not want to steal anybody's land and that they wished to pay a fair market price for any that was taken for public purposes."

The right hon. Gentleman outlined a scheme of purchase and adumbrated an ownership somewhat on the lines covered by the present Amendment. That surely was a safe and wise policy which might have been pursued by the Secretary for Scotland. Why, if they were going to have a scheme applied to England, were they going to apply a different scheme to Scotland? He could not conceive why, when half the Cabinet and most of the Members of the London County Council were now the representatives in that House of Scottish Radical opinion, they considered a scheme suitable to England and yet refused to apply it to Scotland. Was it the mere fact of crossing the Tweed that brought about this change in their opinions? Had the crossing of the Tweed a similar effect upon them as the drinking of the waters of Lethe? Did it induce a feeling of forgetfulness of what was just and honourable in dealing with the landlords of the country? Were they prepared to purchase land fairly in England and at the same time take it away by stealth from the landlords of Scotland? The right hon. Gentleman also advocated his scheme on the ground of cheapness, but he ventured to say that if they had regard to the welfare of the land generally in Scotland, and if they bore in mind that the interests of landlord and tenant were bound together, they would realise that the scheme was by no means cheap, because it was never cheap to deal unfairly with any class of the community. It would not be cheap to discourage the investments which Scottish landlords now made to the extent of £2,500,000 sterling a year in improving their farms, and it would take many years, with the contribution of £65,000 which it was proposed to give Scotland under the Bill, to make up even one year's loss if the money now expended by the landlords on small farms were diverted into other channels. If the right hon. Gentleman would study the Report of the Departmental Committee which had gone carefully into the question he would see that under a system of tenancy somewhat similar to that suggested by the Government the annual rent per acre amounted to £1 14s. 7d., while under a system of purchase, with the interest and capital repayable in fifty years, the tenant would only have to pay £1 10s. 5d. per acre for his land, and ultimately he would arrive at that position of landlordism which some hon. Gentlemen seemed to think was so great an attraction to certain classes of the people. He would like to draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the machinery embodied in the Bill. It was proposed to set up a Land Court consisting of five members, one of whom was to be a legal gentleman of ten years' standing at the Bar. This Court was to hear and determine all matters of law or fact in case of disagreement, and he feared it would prove but another example of the law's delays almost inconceivable to contemplate. From a cursory glance at the Bill, he had estimated that in no fewer than seventeen clauses and sections of the Bill the Land Court would be called upon to exercise its powers. If under Clause 7, Section 8 the Commissioner for Small Holdings reported that no agreement would be reached, then it was provided that the Agricultural Commissioners, after due notice, should intimate to the landlord and other parties concerned that a new holding would be constituted, and that they should then apply to the Land Court to do certain things. What would occur was this. In the event of an application for a small holding, first, there would be an inquiry by a Commissioner, who would make his report. Then the Agricultural Commissioners must give notice for the hearing of the dispute, they must make intimation first to the landlord and then to the other parties concerned, and then they must apply to the Land Court, which in its turn would have practically to go through the same stages. All that might occur in connection with a holding of annual value of £5 or £10, the landlord of which might, for some cogent reason, object to the man whom it was desired to foist upon him as a tenant. Under these circumstances the time of the Land Court and Land Commission would, at great cost to the country, be occupied in settling small, petty, quibbling incidents of bargaining which were now quickly and easily disposed of by the landlord and his factor. He regretted, too, that it was proposed to take away from the Board of Agriculture certain powers it now possessed, and to hand them over to the Agricultural Commissioners in Scotland. The President of the Board of Agriculture had made it his habit to come annually and discuss matters with agriculturists at Edinburgh. They had acquired confidence in the Board of Agriculture which it would be extremely difficult for them to place in the small body adumbrated by the right hon. Gentleman, who would not have at their disposal the machinery which the Board of

Agriculture possessed. He had a profound distrust of the right hon. Gentleman as to his knowledge of agriculture. The right hon. Gentleman had truly said that they could not grow wheat on the Grampians, but he added, "Modern science says, 'Give me manure and water, and I will grow anything.'" If that was the right hon. Gentleman's view of agriculture, he would undertake to make him a present of three acres, and he dared say a right hon. friend would give him the cow, so that he might see whether by providing manure he could manage to make a living on a selected spot. It was perfectly childish to think that on hundreds of thousands of acres under deer forests it would be possible for a man to make a living, or to make a commercial speculation in land in small holdings of any kind.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): Just what I said.

*MR. COCHRANE said he wished an explanation with regard to one of the many difficult points in the Bill. In Clause 7, he observed that assistance might be given by way of gift to the tenants set up under the Bill. What did that mean? If there were two tenants, one with a holding under £50 and another tenant close by who had been there, had made his holding pay by his own industry and skill, and was earning a living and paying a rent—did he intend to set up the new and untried man in the new holding and make him a present of his buildings? That would be a very unfair competition to the man alongside who was paying for his buildings. Was the assistance to be an absolute gift? In the case of a farmer who became bankrupt, what was to happen to the holding and the buildings? Were the buildings to be the property of the creditors or of the landlord? That was a matter of very considerable importance. Could the tenant mortgage the buildings given as a gift? Who was to pay the insurance on the buildings? At present a landlord took care that the buildings should be insured. In the case of buildings provided by the State, who was to see that they were insured? All he could think was that this scheme could be used to provide some means of giving doles to deserving Radical agents—those ardent politicians who had waded through Chinese slavery, and various other "terminological inexactitudes" and who had supported the right hon. Gentleman in his policy, but failed, owing to the courageous honesty of the Lord Chancellor, to attain the dignity of Justice of the Peace. They might now be presented at the cost of the country with a small holding and buildings upon it. Who was to select the new occupants? Were they to be selected by the Land Court, or by the Agricultural Commissioners who were themselves to be selected by a politician, namely, the Secretary for Scotland? That was placing a power in his hands to use public funds for rewarding various merits, which would be extremely undesirable. As to the cost of the Bill, there would be £65,000 per annum available for all purposes connected with the scheme, in addition to the payment of the salaries of the Commissioners. From statements which had been placed before Members of Parliament it appeared that a small holding of £50 rental would cost five or six hundreds pounds for equipment exclusive of water supply, for which a further capital expenditure of £100 must in in many cases be reckoned. He submitted therefore that not more than 100 small holdings in a year could be set up by the proposed scheme. Under existing circumstances 70 per cent. of the holdings in Scotland—62,300 out of the 89,000—were small holdings under £50. How did the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman tend to decrease the process of depopulation in the country districts? The instance of the 400-acre farm in Forfarshire mentioned by the Report of 1906 showed that they would replace eleven persons employed on the farm, comprising the farmer, the grieve, and nine ploughmen, most of whom were householders, by seven small landholders. How they were going to cure depopulation by a scheme of that kind passed his comprehension. What was to happen to the man with the block of big farm buildings after the farm had been broken up into small holdings? Was he to pay the rates on them and to be responsible for their repair and upkeep? These were questions deserving of consideration and reply. He supported the view expressed by the hon. Baronet the Member for East Northamptonshire, in the Report of the Departmental mental Committee. He said—

> "Small holdings can only be made successful by putting the whole thing on a strictly economic basis."

Were they going to put these small holdings on an economic basis? Was the intention of the Government to charge the fair market rent or not? That was a question which should be answered. Was the interest on the cost of the buildings to be economic interest? Was it to be such interest as would repay both capital and interest in a reasonable number of years? How were the rates on improvements to be dealt with? Under the Crofters' Act a man was not rated on his own improvements. If a small holder under £50 set up under this Bill was not to be rated on his own improvements, was the farmer in the same locality who was paying £51 a year to be rated on the whole value of his buildings? If that was so, they would be subsidising and protecting the new holder, not against the foreigner, but against his neighbour next door. If the small holder was to pay the fair value of the land, and to provide a sinking fund for the farm buildings, if he was to pay the full rates on his improvements and was not to have any special reduction of any kind, his position would be ten times worse than that of a small tenant farmer under existing circumstances. By setting up such a system as that they would be doing an incalculable amount of damage to the whole agricultural interest in Scotland. He asked the Lord Advocate whether it was not the fact that mortgages on landed estate in Scotland were already being called in on account of this class of legislation. If the Government would amend the Bill so as to include an honourable, fair, and just system of purchase, they would receive support, not only in this House, but of every person in Scotland.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs) said that he had listened with not a little disappointment to the speech that had just been delivered. There was one portion which contained a series of inquiries of a practical kind, but the speech as a whole was so disfigured with violent expressions and so manifestly full of misconstruction and misapprehension, that it was almost impossible to follow it, except by saying that he took everything from his friend in the best part. He thought he did him an immediate service by checking a mistake which he entered into. Everyone on the opposite side of the House would own that if there was anything of violence in language used he was the first to deprecate it, and the first to see that it was put right so far as he was concerned. As to his reference to dukes, the simple explanation was that the whole of Scotland knew, and the whole House knew, that the Duke of Sutherland was one of the best proprietors that ever lived. The Duke of Sutherland's situation with regard to the Crofters' Act was this: He went before the Crofters' Commission, and so fair were the Crofters' Commission that after considering the circumstances of the case, they in many cases raised the rents the tenants were thenceforth to pay to the Duke, as compared with what the Duke himself had been charging. Of the Duke it could never be said that he was anything but a proprietor *par excellence*. He used his splendid powers with magnificent results. He had the noble Duke in his mind when he heard the wild statements made—that proprietors would be reduced to the position of rent-chargers, and become persons who were the objects of Parliamentary pity. If his hon. friends opposite had thoroughly understood the position he believed that they would have used different language. Hitherto, the debate had been conducted normally, without the use of violent expressions, except perhaps by the hon. Baronet who seconded the Amendment, who made an excited reference to the Ten Commandments in order to express his dislike to the Bill, and by the hon. Member for North Ayrshire who had talked about the Bill being intended to reward Radical agents for their services to ardent politicians. He protested that language of that sort was not favourable to good feeling in the House. He thought that the Bill ought to have been received with different language from that to which the House had listened. The admirable speech of the Solicitor-General for Scotland had never received an answer. Even after this Bill became law, his hon. and learned friend characterised the position of the landords, and asked whether they would not be still landlords in the full sense of the term. They could sell their property; they could burden their property; they could bequeath it; they could shoot, hunt and fish over it; they could feu it; they could plant it; they could lay it out for building purposes; and develop the estate in every possible way. No answer had been given to these arguments of his hon. and learned friend; but it was only said in the picturesque language of the hon. Member for Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities that the property of landlords by this Bill would be reduced to a frail remnant of ownership. He did not think that the full gravity of the problem in Scotland had yet been fully realised by the House. Both as to the distribution of the population and as to the distribution of land the problem in its contrasts exceeded anything that was known either in any other country in Europe or in America. The hon. Member for Huddersfiel, dwhose special knowledge all would acknowledge and value, had written a series of articles carefully analysing the Census Returns for Scotland. In one of these he said —

> "The poverty of Scotland may not be exceptional; the ill-housing of Scotland assuredly is. The spectacle of one-half of an entire nation living under overcrowded conditions, while almost whole counties are preserved as deer forests and private parks, is as astounding as it is happily rare. We are accustomed to regard the distribution of population in England as deplorable and dangerous, but it is immeasurably less serious than the distribution of the population in Scotland. Eight per cent. of over-crowded persons—the figure for England and Wales—pales into comparative insignificance beside the 46 per cent. which is the measure of overcrowding in Scotland. . . . In London, one in every seven of the population lives under overcrowded conditions, *i.e.*, more than two persons to a room; in Leeds and Sheffield, one in ten; in Liverpool, one in twelve; and in Manchester, one in sixteen. In Edinburgh the proportion is one in three; in Dundee and Glasgow, one in two. Taking the whole of Scotland, 493,000 persons live in one-room houses, and more than 2,000,000 persons live crowded together at the rate of more than two persons to a room."

That was the gravity of the situation in regard to the population of Scotland; but what was the gravity of the position in regard to the distribution of land? Sometimes it was said in regard to this Bill that there should have been an inquiry made before it was introduced. Why, Scotland had been full of inquiries. There was a Report of the Commission of 1892, in which the most remarkable testimony was given in regard to the distribution of land in Scotland. The problem laid before that Commission was how much land in Scotland was devoted to sport alone which could be employed for the threefold purpose of allotments, small farms, and the extension of holdings. That Commission was composed of men from both Parties in the State, and they reported to Parliament that at that date 1,800,000 acres of land could usefully be employed for these purposes. The Unionist Government that succeeded did nothing to arrest the growth of deer forests, and the 1,800,000 acres mentioned by the Commission of 1892 had increased until the cultivable land used exclusively for sport amounted, it was estimated, to the stupendous figure of 3,000,000 acres. It was evident, therefore, that there was a congestion of the population in Scotland on a scale unknown to Europe, and this alongside of great tracts of land untilled, but capable, according to the Commission, of being usefully cultivated as small holdings. Was Parliament to take no notice of such a state of things? He had been twitted with having said that when a strong Liberal Government was in power it ought to address itself to the solution of this problem. He admitted the charge. When he thought of rural Scotland so largely allowed to remain desolate he declared to the House that he was reminded of what Tennyson wrote of pagan England—

> "And so there grew great tracts of wilderness,
> Whereon the beast was ever more and more,
> And man was less and less."

It had been said that 70 per cent. of the farms in Scotland were small holdings. That was true. But how much of the land in farm did that 70 per cent. occupy? Only 12 per cent. 62,000 persons farmed land which was worth £690,000 per annum; but, 26,000 persons farmed land which was worth £4,674,000 per annum. To speak of 70 per cent. of the farms being small holdings was, therefore, only to mislead. It was not the proportion to the total number of farms, but the amount of land contained in those farms that was the important factor. Those small holders were the very backbone of the community. He held that it was no credit to the present Government that it should address itself to the solution of this problem. It was not only a political duty, but a high privilege to demand a solution. His hon. friend the Member for Leith did not dispute the gravity of the problem. His Amendment was a very curious one. It admitted that there was a problem of a very serious kind to be solved, and that it must be solved by State intervention. But his hon. friend's Amendment, if adopted, would leave nothing of the Bill. It would tear the Bill to tatters: and the whole of the Unionist Party were going to support it. But upon what terms? On the terms that it was the duty of the State to intervene by way of purchase. In regard to Scotland, if the Unionist Party supported the Amendment, they would be committed to a gigantic scheme of land purchase, a scheme which would altogether out-do the Irish scheme in magnitude before the end could be reached. The Government would have no part or lot in anything of the kind. In the first place they asked as Scotsmen, and they expected a plain reply, what were the terms upon which they were going to purchase? That was a question which had never been answered in this debate. In Ireland purchase was only made after a fair rent had been fixed and they had got a datum to go upon. Was the proposal for Scotland to purchase the land before a fair rent had been fixed? Let that question be answered. Then let them take another point. In Ireland, after the market multiple of the fair rent was fixed, there was a bonus granted of no less than 12 per cent. Was a similar bonus going to be asked for the Scottish landlords? He really wanted to know, because until he knew the terms upon which this property was to be parted with he could not deal with the matter. [An Hon. Member: Market value.] In Ireland 12 per cent. was to be added to the price of the landlord's interest. Were the Scottish landlords to have a similar bonus? They wanted to know the exact value of the transaction. There were great distinctions between the case of the Scottish and the Irish tenant. Under the Irish Act tenant right had never had a fair chance or a free course, and therefore, and on that account alone it had not been justified. The Irish tenant had free sale, but, alas! he was, in spite of the intentions of Parliament, rented on his own improvements. In Scotland there was no free sale, and the result was that there being no free sale of the tenant right, although it looked at first to be a hindrance to the tenant, it had been a source of most miraculous protection to him, because having no realisable asset he did not get into the hands of the money-lender and mortgage his interest. And in Scotland, moreover, not a penny of rent had ever been laid on upon a tenant's own improvements, and the stimulus to improvement was accordingly well-nigh miraculous. But let them take the case of Ireland and examine it. It was said that land purchase was necessary because tenant right in Ireland was a disastrous failure. He wanted to know whether that was actually the case. He was anxious to get a report on that subject from the Land Commission in Dublin itself, and he went the nearest way about it by writing to the most skilled Irish land official that he knew of, Mr. Bailey, a land commissioner. He put to Mr. Bailey the question (there was recently a blunt statement of this kind by Lord Rosebery):—"Was land purchase necessary because tenant right was a disastrous failure in Ireland—that was to say, tenant right under the name of dual ownership?" He thought this matter was important, because it went to the contrast between the Amendment and the Bill, and he hoped the House might pardon him if he read a few sentences. Mr. Bailey wrote—

> "I have had a large experience of fair rents as well as of purchase in Ireland. It is untrue to say that dual ownership has been a disastrous failure in Ireland. It saved the country from ruin and would in my view have been a permanent settlement of the agrarian situation had the fair rents been properly and

adequately administered. You remember the Morley Committee of the House of Commons of 1894 and how the evidence showed and the Report of the Committee demonstrated how the intentions of Parliament were narrowed and rendered ineffectual by legal decisions and the halting administration of the Act of 1881."

Then Mr. Bailey went into what happened under those legal decisions which—he said this without hesitation—were opposed to the deliberate and declared intentions of Parliament in regard to the Irish tenants not being rented on their own improvements, and he showed that under the series of decisions it became the law of Ireland that these poor tenants were driven into litigation on an enormous scale and then at the end of the proceedings they were declared by the Court of Law to be liable to be so rented. The House would observe that under these circumstances Irish tenant right had never had a fair chance. The contrast between the two countries on the point of legal costs was most notable. To get a fair rent fixed cost the tenant in Ireland from £3 to £4. Then an appeal could be laid from that fixing of the fair rent, and that would cost another £3 or £4. The number of appeals was enormous and sometimes amounted to 90,000, and so far as the effect of appeals in altering the rent was concerned it cost on the average £105 to get £1 off the rent. On the other hand in Scotland the crofter approached the Commission, and with great promptitude and without any circumlocution presented his claim, and the whole question was settled with a legal expense to the crofter of 1s. 6d! He said, and he thought he was justified in saying, that in Scotland compared with Ireland tenant right had had a fair chance. In Ireland it was notorious that tenants were driven into purchase by the decision in the case of Dunseath and Adams, and it was, he thought, shown by Mr. Bailey that getting a fair rent fixed was a necessary preliminary before purchase became possible. In the crofting counties of Scotland the Act had been so administered that 26 per cent. reduction had been made in regard to rent. That was a reduction which would have been made by economic processes. A great reduction had also been made of 67 per cent. in outstanding arrears. The result was that while in Ireland tenant right had been distorted and ruined, in Scotland tenant right had been vindicated and justified. Therefore there was contentment among crofters under the position guaranteed to them by the law. If they were consulted he did not think that there were 3 per cent. of them who would exchange their position and become purchasers. Instead of tenant right being a disastrous failure in Scotland, it had been a complete success. The Crofters Acts had saved enormous sums of money, and without any chaffering the rent was fixed for seven years at the cost of a few pence, and all the confusion which formerly existed had now given way to an era in which landlords and tenants had been brought back to the most friendly relations. Many straths and glens had been transformed into prosperous homes and communities. He knew very well that the strong view which was taken against the Bill was that if the rent was fixed in this way and permanent tenure was given, it would prevent improvements being made in any remunerative fashion by the landlord and the land would be starved. The prophecies of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, made by him with regard to the Crofter Act of 1886, that that legislation would injure the landlord and that the poverty which had been chronic would not be mitigated. had been proved to be entirely wrong. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the State would have to give pecuniary assistance in the case of the crofters but they did not.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: You did.

*****Mr. THOMAS SHAW** said they did not give them pecuniary assistance, and the moment the crofter had fixity of tenure and a fair rent, the change began. He instanced Skye. Was there a more wind-swept, rain-swept island anywhere? And yet upon that island the calculation was that those poor crofters, "the description of whose misery had so moved them to-night," and who could not supply capital, had supplied capital to the value of £150,000 in houses and little steadings. And he understood from the hon. Member for Ross-shire that in the Island of Lewes the same system was going on and the capital invested had reached the figure of £50,000.

Mr. WEIR: And more.

*Mr. THOMAS SHAW: And more. So it was altogether out of the question to say that while the landlord was satisfied and the tenant was satisfied the land had suffered. It had not suffered. It had, on the contrary, benefited by that magic which came of tenant right and fair and equitable conditions of holding. That was their experience in Scotland of tenant right. They had also experience of purchase in Scotland under the Congested Districts Board. They did not like it. There were rumours that the people who were now their own lairds under the scheme longed to go back to the position of crofters, in which they knew where they were, and could work out their own destiny less hampered by official supervision. In two cases—one of settling holdings of land by purchase and the other of settling them by hiring—their experience was of a remarkable kind. Again, he took the case of Syre. Under the system of purchase the small holder obtained from the Government £153 as a free grant and £650 as loan money, so that the cost of settling a small holder under a system of purchase was £380. They then went to another neighbourhood—the nearest case to Syre, the case of Dunbeath, where instead of settling these small holders by a system of purchase, they proceeded by a system of hiring, and found that the average expense there was £10 free grant and loan money £13, or £23 in all.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR asked if in both cases steadings were set up, or that it was only in the case of purchase that they would be provided for.

*Mr. THOMAS SHAW said his impression was that in both cases buildings had to be provided.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Buildings provided for £23?

*Mr. THOMAS SHAW said it should be observed that the buildings were provided by the assistance of the Government *plus* the capital which the lessee had. The assumption of the Party opposite was that these people could not be set up on their own holdings without assistance from the State to the fullest extent. But these people had not only bone and muscle and sinew, but a certain little banking account. The contrast he had drawn between the case of purchase and leasing was vivid. He admitted he had given an extreme case. In another the contrast was between £203 and £71. And the best calculation he could make was that for every £1 which was spent in settling by leaseholding on fair terms with fixity of tenure, £20 was required for settlement by purchase. So that, if the Amendment meant that they were to prefer purchase to hiring, his reply was that hiring had the advantage in the economic ratio of 20 to 1. The House would be entirely mistaken if it thought they were taking a leap in the dark, because there was experience in Scotland extending over twenty years in the case of hiring and ten years in the case of purchase. Under tenant right the land had been improved and the tenants had been content. Nor could he have any share in either directly or indirectly condemning the legislation of 1881 as it passed this House in regard to Ireland. The failure there took place with respect to administration and the enormous cost of carrying out the scheme. But with all its faults that legislation had not been a disastrous failure; though purchase could only be entered into after a fair rent had been fixed. The labourers in Scotland, who, it was said, would not be helped by this Bill, were enthusiastic in its favour. It was the only chance they saw of getting easy access to the land. There was nothing in the Bill, he assured the mover of the Amendment, which was adverse to what he called silviculture or to intensive cultivation. It was suggested that the Bill would reduce the landlord's *status* and power so that his property became a pale, ineffectual shadow of ownership. Here again they remembered the old discredited prophecies. The same language was used prior to the Irish land legislation of 1881. Let them apply a test to this shadowy ownership. Very different language was used when these shadowy rights had to be assessed on their capital value. The Irish tenant knew that well. When purchase came about, that shadowy ownership was so substantial, so strong, so little bloodless and anæmic that it was able to extort from the British Treasury a bonus over and above the purchase price. So that as the Bill now was, they viewed all these arguments as to depreciating and whittling away all the landlords' rights with a considerable measure of composure. He was quite certain that if a scheme of purchase were proposed in Scotland—that was, after this scheme of adjustment with the tenants—history would again repeat itself. And the shadowy would become the very substantial—only to be liquidated in coin of the realm. If Scotland was going her own way in this, she did so, he hoped, without any disapproval from her Irish friends. They generally knew what they were about in Scotland. If she was going her own way, she did so starting from a careful and much scrutinised experience. He would like to interpolate, if he might, one word of gratitude; it might be late but it was none the less true. He knew from his old and lamented friend, Lord Kinross, who was so highly esteemed a Member of that House, and who had so much to do with passing the Crofters' Act, that no more valuable assistance was obtained in framing that Act than came from the Irish Members, who had gone through the fire, and knew how the law could upset the meaning of Parliamentary language. Therefore, the Crofters' Act in Scotland had stood proof against all attack—he withdrew the word "attack," for there had been no attack—and no tenant had ever been rented upon his improvements. He admitted quite frankly that the awful contrast and problem which he had stated would not be settled completely by this Bill or by any one Bill. His Majesty's Government were not neglecting the land problem on its other side, as disclosures might soon show. It was not within the power even of a powerful House to settle a social question of this kind apart from other elements which were altogether out of its sphere. Even were all their political adjustments complete, there would still remain the questions of thrift, sobriety, self-reliance, the habits and character of the people, whether their ambitions were low or lofty; and all that kind of problem, the personal and even the social one, would remain. But as a Government, and as a House, they could never forget that the virtues along with strength of body and mind were nurtured in the homestead; and the whole idea underlying this Bill, the idea which was dearest to him, was the idea of the homestead. Though the conditions of that homestead might be rigorous, they were at all events healthy, breeding hardihood and power. And under this scheme they would have independence, which, to him, was greater as an incentive than any other prompting of national policy. It was not a class they wished to favour; it was a race of men they wished to preserve.

*MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said the right hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister had interrupted his hon. friend the Member for North Ayrshire when quoting a Return published last year in reference to the agricultural population. His hon. friend had pointed out that the figures which the Prime Minister had selected as affirming his statement that land for small holdings was difficult to obtain in certain counties, were not borne out by the facts. He would also point out that before the Departmental Committee, Lord Carrington's estate agent had asserted that there was no difficulty in obtaining land for experimental purposes with regard to small holdings. In the speech they had just heard the right hon. Gentleman had had a good deal to say about the question of land in Scotland available for deer forests; but the Return from which the right hon. Gentleman made his quotations was for the year 1892, and it was getting a little bit out of date. There was a Return for last year in which were included those counties in which deer forests most largely abounded, in other words, Argyll, Inverness, Sutherland, and Ross and Cromarty. He would like the House to see what the state of these counties was in regard to the supply of land for small holdings. There was no information in the Return with regard to Sutherland. With reference to Ross and Cromarty it stated that there were a number of crofters emigrating to Canada and there was no demand for vacant crofts. In Argyll there was said to be little demand for allotments and small holdings, and there was no difficulty in getting the land where it was required. The House would see from the Return that there was no difficulty in these deer-ridden counties in acquiring land for small holdings. It was asked why? If they took the Report with regard to Inverness it would at once become apparent to the House. Mr. Cran wrote—

> "There is no difficulty in obtaining small holdings in high altitudes, but few allotments are available and the small holdings have not been a great success. What is wanted by small farmers and crofters especially is ownership of the land they occupy."

What was the Lord Advocate's authority for saying that not more than 3 per cent. of the people of Scotland wanted to purchase? He would like to see the data on which the right hon. Gentleman based his figures. He did not base any argument on any absence of demand, because he for one believed that small holdings could be prosperous only if they were established on a sound economic basis, and on such a basis he believed there would be a demand for small holdings, but he denied that there would be any demand for them on the basis which the Government proposed. He proposed to examine the Bill from the point of view of the different parties affected. To begin with the smallest holders—what he wanted to know from the Government was whether or not the cottars were to be included in this Bill. Was there to be fixity of tenure for the tenant of the small holder? If there was to be fixity of tenure, if the tenant of the small holder was to have rights and privileges, and if the rights and privileges of the small holder were to be broken in upon, then the small holders in Scotland would have something not very pleasant to say to the members of the Government. Let them take the next class. What was the position of the existing small holder? His hope, very naturally, would be for a reduction of rent. A reduction of rent was at best problematical; and did the House think that the small holder would view with satisfaction the absolute certainty of incurring increased charges which at the present moment were borne by the landlord—charges for upkeep and charges for matters like fencing and draining? Did the Government think that the small holder would be delighted to learn that he was going to be rated on the value of buildings, while the new small holder was not going to be rated? Did they think that he would be pleased to know that the Government intended to give money by way of gift or loan to the new small holder, while he was to get nothing, while he would thus have to compete with a subsidised competitor, and, more than that, while he would be asked to contribute towards the subsidy? Did they think that the existing small holder would be pleased with that? Did they think that he would be pleased to know that his customary system of tenure was no longer to be possible for him? Did they think that the existing smallholder would be pleased when, under this Bill, everything was to be reduced to a stereotyped and cast-iron formula, and elasticity of private contract removed? When the small holder realised what his position under the Bill was going to be, he would certainly think that any reduction of rent which might accrue to him would be bought at a very dear price. As to the new small holder, the right hon. Gentleman had said that of all people in the world surely the new holder, under this Bill, was entitled to be called blessed. He got his land provided for him with the assistance of the State, and he got State assistance for raising buildings, and yet he could never rise to the full magic of property, while he had to face under this Bill the almost inevitable miseries of mortgage. He wondered if hon. Members opposite had realised what was in the Bill. Did they realise that under Clause 15 a man who was indebted to the State was to be no longer a freeman but a serf, and tied to the soil? They were setting up the Council of three and the Court of five to whom the small holder was to be bound. They were to be the arbiters of his destiny, the Lords of his head, the gombeen-men of the State. Let them take the class of farmers. Up and down Scotland farmers' associations had been passing resolutions condemning the principles of the Bill. He invited the Lord Advocate and any hon. Member opposite whether now or later on in the debate, to rise and tell him of one farmers' association in Scotland which had passed a resolution in favour of the principle of the Bill.

MR. A. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.) said the Lothian Farmers' Association passed a resolution unanimously in favour of the Bill.

*MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON said that that must be a unique instance.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): No, Sir, it is not.

*MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON said that at any rate the central association which represented all the farming associations, the Chamber of Agriculture, had passed such a resolution condemning the principles of Bill, and that association represented generally agricultural opinion in Scotland. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] In the debates on the Land Tenure Bill they were told by the hon. Baronet the Member for South Somerset that it did represent the agricultural opinion of Scotland.

MR. MORTON (Sutherlandshire) said he absolutely denied that statement.

*MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON said the resolution against the principles of the Bill was passed by the Central Chamber of Agriculture by a majority of eight to one. That resolution was passed against an amendment, which was voted down, to the effect that the Bill was to be approved as an honest attempt to deal with the difficulty. Indeed, a petition from the Chamber against the Bill had been presented to the House. He did not wonder that the farmers of Scotland had taken that view. Had hon. Members opposite considered the penalties which were to be inflicted upon the farmer? Apart from the question of damages or compensation for destruction or loss of revenue in the working of the farm—and it was questionable whether any damages could be enforced at all because there was no provision for enforcing them—the farmer was subject to three penalties. In the first place, as a taxpayer he had to provide his contribution to the extra sum of £85,000 which was going to be raised under the Bill. In the second place, he had to contribute his mite to the sustenance of the great official hierarchy which was going to batten on the public purse in carrying out the provisions of the Bill. In the third place, as a ratepayer he had to make up the difference caused by the loss in rateable value in his own area arising from the loss on that proportion of the rental which was represented by the interest on advances made through the Agricultural Commissioners, and by the difference between the value of the farm buildings as they existed now and those same buildings as they would be valued if they were buildings occupied by the small holders. Those were differences which would fall upon all ratepayers within the rating area. Therefore they could not wonder that the farmers who were taxpayers and ratepayers were inclined to look askance at the proposals made by the Government. When they came to the last class of persons affected—the present landowner—of course they were face to face with the question of principle already alluded to. Before dealing with that he would like to put one or two specific points to the Government upon which he desired a clear statement. In the first place, there was the question of the march fences. In case outlying portions of an estate were taken, who was going to pay for the erection of the march fences, which would cost at least 6d. a yard, and if they were going to put up a good fence it would cost anything between 1s. and 1s. 3d. per yard? Was the landlord, or the small owner, or the Land Court going to find that money? Then there was another point with regard to insurance. Who was going to be responsible for insuring the buildings? Had that got to be done by the small holders, the State, or the landowner? They were told that the landlord had no interest in the buildings. Was the State going into the insurance business, or was it to be done by the small holder, and, if so, what guarantee was there that the money the small holder recovered was going to be applied to the replacement of the building? What would happen in the case of the bankruptcy of a small holder? He would also like to know if a small holder could borrow money on his improvements? He noticed, too, that compensation was payable for the injury to the letting value of the land, but what about injury to the letting value of the building? What about injury or loss resulting from the fact that the buildings left on the farm were too big after small holdings had been struck off? Was there to be any compensation for that? Let them take a more extreme case—that of ploughmen's cottages. On some estates rows of these cottages had been built. If a large number of small owners came on that estate the ploughmen's cottages would be valueless and would represent a dead loss. Who was going to pay for them? Why was this question of compensation to be settled by the Land Court who would be judges in their own cause, and not by arbitration? Then again, in regard to fair rents. Fair rents was very much of a misnomer, because it apparently meant a rent which in one way was fair and which in another way was unfair. For if the tenant thought his rent was too high, he could either renounce his holding or not enter into it; but if the landlord thought the rent was too low he could not say that he would not let the land, because he was bound to let it under the Bill. That might or might not be a good thing, but what he asked the House to remember was that the words "fair rent" were hardly appropriate to an operation of that kind. Then as to buildings erected by the tenant. This was really a very important point. Supposing they had got an estate suitable for feuing, and nearly, but not quite, ripe for that purpose, the small holder who held a bit of land might take it into his head to erect buildings upon it. Was the landlord to have no control over those buildings? Was he to watch them being erected in the sure and certain knowledge that when he came to take over the land he would have to pay the full value for those buildings simply in order that he might pull them down? Then what about the land during the interval provided under Clause 14? There was no power to let the land pending the decision of the Land Court, and who was to be responsible to the landlord for the rent during that period? Supposing they had a bit of land hanging in this condition between heaven and earth, which the landlord could not let, supposing the buildings had been run down by the last tenant and the local public health authority came down upon the landowner and condemned the buildings as being in a bad sanitary state and ordered them to be put right; did the Government propose to sanction a system by which a local authority could call upon the landlord to put buildings into a sanitary condition when it had been laid down in the Bill that the landlord would not be permitted to touch those buildings? That was one of the difficulties. Clause 14 was responsible for a large part of the objection which had been raised to dual ownership. There seemed to be a certain amount of misunderstanding on the Treasury Bench upon this point, because the Solicitor-General for Scotland had devoted a long and elaborate argument to the nature of the ownership, and had proved to his own satisfaction that the Bill did not establish dual ownership. Then the Lord-Advocate had declared that the Bill did create dual ownership and defended the measure upon that score. By the time the debate ended he hoped the Government would make up their minds which horse they were going to ride. If he understood the Solicitor-General for Scotland aright he said that dual or divided ownership was a vile phrase which was unknown to the law of Scotland, and he went on to say that what was known to the law was joint ownership. He proceeded to argue that this Bill did not create joint ownership. No one ever suggested that it did. It was perfectly clear that the Bill certainly did not create joint ownership; for in joint ownership any loss fell on both parties, whereas it was clear from the provisions of the Bill that all the loss would be borne by one party, the landlord. In regard to the question of divided ownership, he asked the hon. and learned Gentleman to recollect that in going through his catalogue of powers and functions he was not entirely accurate, for there were cases in which the landlord was forbidden to let his property, and there were cases in which the tenant was allowed to bequeath his property. On the general question he would put the matter in the form of an apologue, Supposing he gave the Solicitor-General a motor-car, he would have full and undivided property in it, subject, of course, to the law of the land. But supposing he gave it to him on the condition that the car was only to be used for the purpose, unless he gave leave to use it otherwise, of drivingthe Chancellor of the Duchy about London, would the hon. Gentleman say that his ownership was still undivided? Would he not say that it was in commission between himself, the giver, and the Chancellor of the Duchy? And if, instead of having the car given to him, the hon. Gentleman found these restrictions were being imposed on the use of a car which he had bought and paid for with his own money, would he still say that he possessed undivided property in the car? He left the hon. and learned Gentleman to his own conscience. He would only ask him whether under this system the voluntary agreements for the constitution of small holdings which had been entered into in considerable numbers in recent years were likely to continue? In Scotland there had been a steady increase in the number of farms of what might be called small holdings size. Since 1895 farms over 300 acres had decreased from 18,787 to 17,828; those of five to fifty acres had increased from 33,921 to 34,645; and those of fifty to 300 acres had increased from 22,802 to 23,123. The increase was thus most marked in the class which this Bill was intended to benefit. Did the hon. and learned Gentleman think that these voluntary agreements would continue if this Bill became law? He could hardly believe that the hon. Gentleman would give an answer in the affirmative. They were told that the Bill was an experiment. Why was Scotland to be made the *corpus vile* of this experiment? Was a different experiment to be made in England, and, if so, what was the reason for the difference? Why was Scotland to have set up this miserable substitute for the Board of Agriculture? Why was Scotland not to have a branch of the Board of Agriculture? Why did the Government persist in ignoring the recommendations of the Departmental Committee that sat on this subject, who said on page 31 of their Report (Cd. 3277)—

> "The Committee recommend, therefore, that special branches of the Board of Agriculture for England and Scotland be formed for the purpose of making definite experiments on an adequate scale and on an economic basis in the creation of small holdings. . . The Committee lay special stress on the desirability of regarding such action as experimental, inasmuch as the evidence placed before them goes to show that encouragement and example, together with demonstration of the economic soundness of land sub-division is necessary to encourage both private owners and local authorities to embark in the operation."

Why did the Government not act on that recommendation? Why did they not "ca' canny?" There might be other than economic reasons for the course that was being taken, and he observed that there were seventy Members of the House who were vice-presidents of the Land Nationalisation Society, including the names of three Members of the Government. Before the mass of the Government supporters hastened into the lobby in support of this measure, he would remind them of the aphorism of Montaigne—He who transfers property from its owner to another does not deserve the name of Liberal.

*Mr. ERSKINE (Perthshire, W.) said he would endeavour to meet two objections in principle which had been urged by hon. Gentlemen who had spoken in opposition to the Bill. It had been stated again and again in the course of the debate that there was no demand for this Bill. They had been asked, Why, then, disturb the present condition of affairs in Scotland, which were going on in an agreeable way? That was urged by the hon. Member for North Ayrshire. The other objection was that the Bill proposed to introduce a system of dual or divided ownership, and that it would be accompanied by the same undesirable results that had accompanied dual ownership in Ireland. If those two objections were not mutually destructive, they were, at any rate, contradictory, because if there was no demand for the Bill, if public opinion in Scotland did not support the measure, and if it did not embody the wishes of a large section of the agricultural community, then it would remain a dead letter, and the spectre of dual ownership would not be raised. The Report on the decline of the agricultural population, which had been referred to more than once in the course of the debate, stated that the majority of the correspondents reported that there was a demand for small holdings which was not satisfied. Reports were received to this effect from correspondents in Aberdeenshire, Banffshire, Forfarshire, Kincardineshire, Peebles-shire, Perthshire, Roxburghshire, Inverness-shire, Ayrshire, and Caithness. All stated that there was a demand for small holdings, and that the demand had not been met. He thought that those who had come into contact with agricultural feeling in rural districts would say that there was a strong demand that the principles embodied in the Bill should be carried out. The strongest demand of all was to be found in the Census Returns for the last decennial period—1891 to 1901. The Returns showed that the population in the rural districts had declined by 4·6 per cent. That did not represent the full gravity of the case. The natural increase of 11 per cent. had disappeared, so that in 1901 the rural population was nearly 16 per cent. lower as compared with 1901, than it ought to have been if normal conditions had prevailed. He was sure that no hon. Member would deny that the demand for legislation was not only articulate but clamant. The second objection which had been again and again urged was that the Bill established a system of dual or divided ownership. He used that phrase to express the condition of partnership where the land was hired. Hon. Members who had urged that objection had held up the case of Ireland as a warning. The dual or divided ownership contemplated by this measure was not the dual ownership which had existed in Ireland. The House well knew that Irish dual ownership was described as the "three F's"—fair rent, fixity of tenure, and free sale. Where was the free sale under this Bill? It was not included, and he thought rightly not included, because it would be accompanied by most undesirable results in Scotland. He could not agree with the mover of the Amendment that if they had divided ownership they must also have free sale. The evils of free sale had been simply put by the Lord Advocate in an article which he contributed recently to the *Nation*. Under free sale one of the main advantages given by the Bill would be defeated, and that was fair rents. The hon. Member for East Aberdeenshire had pointed out that in his constituency the excessive demand for small holdings had forced up the rents above their economic value. If a landlord got an offer for a farm he naturally asked himself whether there was not a risk that the offerer of a very high rent would not be tempted to skin the land so as to recoup himself during the lease, and therefore he often accepted a lower offer. But under free sale that would not be the case. The seller of tenant right would have no further interest in the soil; he got cash down for his right, and left the incoming tenant with an overwhelming weight of purchase money upon him. Therefore, free sale had, in his opinion, been wisely left out of the provisions of the Bill. There would under this Bill be a condition of partnership between the landlord and the tenant, but that in no way differed in principle from the divided ownership established under the Agricultural Holdings Act of 1883 as regarded manuring and similar improvements. That limited ownership was recognised and extended by the Act of 1900, under which the tenant was able to carry out drainage operations, and the principle was still further extended by the Act of 1906 in connection with the maintenance of buildings. By these Acts the tenant had to be compensated before he left his holding for the improvements which he had effected and which were not exhausted. He could see no difference in principle between the proposals under this Bill and the Acts which he had mentioned. The hon. Member for North Ayrshire had told them and the Scottish Chamber of Agriculture had said that the Bill provided for not only dual but triple ownership. But if so, then there had already been triple ownership under the Drainage Act of 1896, under which £4,000,000 had been advanced by the State to the landowners of the country to carry out drainage operations, or else what constituted triple ownership when £65,000 a year was advanced to tenants, that did not constitute triple ownership when £4,000,000 was advanced to landlords? No doubt the system under the present Bill might become a little more complex, the interests might be in different proportions, but any objection on that ground could well be met by the Agricultural Commissioners having a record made of the state of the holdings coming under the operation of the Act and on each subsequent application to the Land Court. That would be a security against bad cultivation; it would ensure the taxpayer that the subject on which he had advanced money would not be deteriorated. The Bill was conceived, not in a hostile spirit against landlords, but to deal with the great national malady of rural depopulation. Some hon. Members had prophesied the disastrous effect which would ensue if the Bill became law; they said that large farms would be abolished; but the Government had declared that they wanted every kind of culture and every variety in size of farm. The hon. Member for Durham had spoken about small holdings picking out the eyes of the land, but the hon. Gentleman must be well aware that it was to be suitable land that was to be taken for small holdings, and that the Agricultural Commissioners would see to it that only suitable land for such holdings was taken. In these days isolated small holdings would not pay; they must be grouped and so give full facilities for co-operation. Another objection which had been urged was that the Bill would dry up the money that had been laid out on farms in Scotland. The hon. Member for Leith had said that £2,000,000 a year was at present spent on farms in Scotland, and the hon. Member for North Ayrshire had stated the sum at £2,500,000. He did not know where they got their figures, but taking the rental of the farms in Scotland at £5,300,000 and £2,000,000 as spent on the farms per annum that amounted to 36 per cent. on the rental. [Opposition cheers.] Hon. Members opposite cheered, but those estates on which 36 per cent. of the rental was spent in improvements must be in a very high state of upkeep. He held, however, that over a long period of years 36 per cent. was an excessive rate of outlay which was of economic necessity, and that on most estates 20 per cent. would be found to be sufficient. Of that rental there was over £690,000 representing holdings of £50 a year and under. No doubt on such holdings the landlord would not spend as much as he had hitherto done, but then the land-holder would spend the money. He did not believe in all the gloomy prophesies which had been made as to the effect of this Bill if it became law. It was a measure to keep people on the land, which would give people freer access to the land, encourage cultivation of the land, and open a fuller and more complete career to those who now lived on the land.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): I congratulate the hon. Member who has just sat down upon the moderation of his speech and the sincere attempt which he made to grapple with some few of the problems presented by the Bill, which I cannot help regarding as one of the most extraordinary projects of legislation ever submitted to the House. I wish that the last spokesman for the Government had followed the course which the hon. Gentleman subsequently pursued and that the Lord Advocate had really tried to deal with the questions which this Bill raises. But the right hon. and learned Gentleman made no such attempt. No doubt the right hon. and learned Gentleman was very persuasive, especially when he was addressing an audience not intimately acquainted with the subject. I could not help being struck by one omission from the right hon. and learned Gentleman's speech. He criticised my hon. friend the Member for North Ayrshire for the tone and temper of some of his remarks, and he was good enough to say that my hon. friend had concluded his speech by asking a series of very practical questions which deserved an answer, but the hon. Member for North Ayrshire did not get that answer. I cannot help thinking that if the right hon. and learned Gentleman had confined himself less to rhetoric—which, in its proper place, I greatly admire—no one would have had cause to complain, and if he had made rather more of an attempt to grapple with the problems stated with great clearness and moderation by my hon. friend, the discussion would have been more greatly advanced than it is. There is one point to which the hon. Member who has just sat down, the Lord Advocate, and almost everybody who has spoken on that side of the House, appeared to be in agreement, viz.: that in Scotland we are suffering from rural depopulation, and that this Bill is a measure by which rural depopulation, if it cannot be wholly cured, may at all events be greatly diminished. The right hon. Gentleman began his speech by giving the House a lurid account, partly in his own words and partly in the words of the hon. Member for Huddersfield, of the condition of Scotland, which was described as unique in Europe—unique because you had at the same time and in close proximity the extreme of congestion in one place and the extreme of depopulation in another. Of course it is perfectly easy for anybody who does not know the geographical configuration of Scotland to point out on the map that there are great areas in the northern half where the population is extremely sparse, and then to go on to say that close to that great area you have cities like Glasgow where the congestion is great and where undoubtedly the condition of a large number of inhabitants, although greatly improved, is still far removed from what any Member of this House would desire to see permanent. But what relation have those two facts to one another? Does the right hon. Gentleman really ask the House or the country to believe that Glasgow is overcrowded because there are deer forests in Rosshire or Inverness-shire? That is really playing with one of the greatest and most difficult problems with which we have to deal. Everybody admits how pressing is the urban question, but we are only deferring the solution of that question if we treat it in the rhetorical manner dear to the heart of the right hon. Gentleman, but so little instructive and so little calculated to help us to find a way out of the difficulties, not only in Glasgow, but in every great centre of population in Scotland, England, France, Germany and America. We all know, or everybody ought to know, that this so called migration from the country is not the result of a particular system of land tenure in this country or that country; that it prevails in countries where the habitual mode of tenure is in small holdings; that it prevails in countries where the habitual mode of tenure is in large holdings; that it prevails where estates are big, where estates are small, and where the amount of unoccupied land is practically limitless. Is it not rather unwise to hold out to us on all sides of the House, who are most anxious to come to close quarters with this condition of urban population, random guesses and quack remedies, which have nothing to do with the real malady which greatly preoccupies us? The hon. Member for Blackfriars dwelt at some length, and somewhat in the same style as the Lord Advocate, with this question, but I think that everybody ought to remember that however you are going to deal with the urban problem you do not diminish its gravity or its difficulty by increasing the number of the rural inhabitants of the country. The effect is exactly the reverse. You increase the difficulty by bringing people in the ordinary phrase "back to the land," and you must remember to distinguish between the permanent phases and the passing phases of this problem. It is quite true of course that if an industry like agriculture goes through a period of deep depression, as it is indeed doing now, and as it did more acutely a few years ago, it is inevitable, as it is in engineering, in cotton spinning, and in other trades, that the employment in that trade will be smaller, and people will have to go to other places where new occupations can be found. That has nothing to do with land tenure, it is the result of plain, simple economic processes. It may be the fact that you can contrive to have some alteration in your land tenure which would for a time keep more people on the land, increase the number of persons gaining a livelihood by working the land, but if you think that that is going to diminish rural migration to the towns you have omitted to consider the plainest, and most obvious facts of the case. The larger the number of families whose heads are engaged in agriculture, the larger will be the number of people who in normal circumstances will necessarily migrate from the rural to the urban districts, and it is so for the plain reason that the number who can properly be employed in agriculture under any system is limited. You cannot lay down precise limits. If you have more land under grass it will be more difficult to introduce successfully what is now called intensive cultivation. The number is limited, and the more you increase the number of families engaged in agriculture, the larger is the source—the birth-rate remaining the same—from which people will have to leave agriculture and to enter the towns and find those varied employments which can only be found in towns or at least cannot be found in rural districts. That is a mathematical proposition which cannot be disputed, a proposition left out of account in these discussions, and yet one of the greatest possible importance. If we are to turn our mind from the temporary phase due to agricultural depression and to concentrate our gaze upon the present relations between urban and rural communities, it is capable of mathematical demonstration that the larger the number engaged in agriculture the larger the number who migrate to the town. I put that argument to the House because it is apt to be forgotten; but I ought to add that I do not believe the present Bill of the Government will greatly add to the number of families engaged in rural work in Scotland. I do not think myself that it is very relevant to the discussion, although strictly relevant to the arguments of the Lord Advocate, of the hon. Member who has just sat down, and of the hon. Member for Blackfriars. The Government themselves do not contemplate that the number of people engaged in agriculture will be greatly augmented by this Bill. They have indeed made special provision in the Bill which will check the only conceivable means by which the number of persons could be greatly augmented. That only conceivable means is by intensive cultivation, by devoting labour and money to very highly manured and very highly prepared ground. That can only be carried out on holdings and probably on very much smaller holdings than £50. Directly you have created a £50 holding you have for all time prevented that holding being used for intensive cultivation. It is immune.

The SECRETARY for SCOTLAND (Mr. Sinclair, Forfarshire): No.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill says "No." If he will tell me where in the Bill the holder of a £50 holding who is using his farm for ordinary agricultural purpose can be dispossessed in favour of three or more people who are prepared to use it for intensive cultivation I will admit that his argument is correct. How are they to be dispossessed?

Mr. SINCLAIR: The Bill includes holdings of all sorts, from one acre to fifty acres. The holder of any holding has complete security for the outlay and capital which he puts into the holding. He has therefore every encouragement for intensive cultivation.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman is mistaken. If a man holds a farm of £50 rental it will not pay him to go in for intensive cultivation.

Mr. SINCLAIR: It may or it may not; he can give it up.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: He can give it up, but you cannot get it, and that is the point I want to make. The right hon. Gentleman proposes to create a large number of holdings, some of which are to be far above the limits of intensive cultivation. These are to be immune from any species of sub-division for all time. It may be desirable that these holdings should be cut up. But however much the good landlord, if he had it in his power, would cut such a holding up, he cannot touch it; the Land Commission cannot touch it; the bureaucratic tribunal which the right hon. Gentleman proposes to set up cannot touch it; it remains there an obstacle to the very policy which he tells us he means to carry out. The Lord Advocate threw down a challenge. He said nobody had replied to the speech of his learned friend the Solicitor-General for Scotland who spoke yesterday afternoon. One of the people who replied to his learned friend the Solicitor-General was himself, because the Solicitor-General for Scotland insisted that there was nothing in the nature of tenant right created by this Bill, and the whole speech of the right hon. Gentleman depended, in his own terminology at any rate, on the fact that the system of tenant right was contemplated; but I do not propose to leave the reply only to the Lord Advocate, and I will ask the Solicitor-General for Scotland whether the main intention of his speech was not that fixity of tenure was the one thing which the Bill desired to give. I do not propose to argue whether fixity of tenure is good or bad at this moment, but I want to ask on what possible principle the Government have arranged that fixity of tenure shall be given and given alone to holdings of land up to £50 in value. Above £50 the ordinary circumstances are to prevail, and labourers, cotters, every class engaged in agriculture except these favoured few, are to be left without this fixity of tenure which, according to the Solicitor-General for Scotland, is the one blessing the Bill is intended to bestow on the people of Scotland. I do not understand what is the object of the Government. They do not pretend, broadly speaking, that there have been foolish or cruel evictions; they do not pretend that there are grievances to be remedied; and, if there are no grievances to be remedied, how is fixity of tenure going to affect rural depopulation or good husbandry? Is it to be said that every man has a right to remain in the occupation of the home where he happens to be? If so, extend that right. Well, there are some 38,000,000 in Great Britain all having equal right to a home and, I suppose, equal right to fixity of tenure or I do not know why they have not. I, for example, a tenant of the Crown, may be described as a national tenant; but the nation does not propose to give me fixity of tenure. I wish it would. There are vast numbers of the urban and rural population to whom this might apply. I do not understand why the Government have brought forward this particular proposal, unless they can show that the class to whom they offer it are suffering under an exceptional state of things. But there is no attempt to show that; there is no suggestion that a grievance exists; and to bring in a Bill which is to be universal in its application, upsetting the whole historical basis of land tenure for Scotland, to remedy a grievance which those who bring it in do not pretend exists, appears to me to be foolish and extravagant legislation. My experience of letting farms in Scotland when I was young was that the universal practice was to give nineteen years leases, and that was all the landlord wished to give or the tenant to take; but now tenants will not take nineteen years leases. They say—or, at least, that is so in the part of the country with which I am acquainted—the conditions of agriculture are so uncertain that they do no care to commit themselves to such a term; they refuse to have that approximation to stability of tenure which the Government desire to impose *nolens volens* on every holder under £50. I have another grievance against the Lord Advocate more serious than any I have yet advanced. I listened to his speech from beginning to end, as did many Members I am now addressing, and their applause showed they listened in an admiring, favouring spirit. To those admirers I now appeal; did the Lord Advocate from beginning to end rest his case on anything except upon what was going on beyond the Highland line and in the crofting countries? If this were a Bill to amend the Crofters Act, I should be glad to discuss it on its merits. For good or for evil, the House has adopted a different principle in crofting tenures—a system which might be suitable to those areas, but to extend the principle to areas historically, climatically, and economically different, at all events requires justification. Did the right hon. Gentleman give any? He gave none whatsoever; not only did he give no justification, but he did not touch the subject. In the Lowlands of Scotland you have a system of farming more highly developed, I believe, within its limits, than is found in any other country in the world—a system upon which there has been larger expenditure by landlord and tenant than is found anywhere else. The expenditure by the tenant is now protected, and rightly protected, from any invasion by the landlord. Dealing with this system, which produces admirable and surprising results, down comes the Government, and upon the ground that a certain class of legislation has succeeded in another part of the country where the people and the soil are poor and agriculture backward, where the history of the tenure is altogether different, and, on the strength of that alone, proposes to introduce into this highly-developed system of the Lowlands that which may or may not be suited to the

Highlands, and could only be suitable there because, from the nature of the case, agriculture was in a backward state. From even the Highland point of view the right hon. Gentleman is wrong. In his statement of the Highland case the right hon. Gentleman attacked me for a speech I made some twenty years ago, in which I said that if the poverty of the Highlands was such as had been described in the debate then the people would not be able to raise themselves under the Act from the position in which they were, and that public contributions would be required. They were required and given. When the right hon. Gentleman brings forward a case—of course, I have not had an opportunity of examining it—in which, with only a small contribution from public funds, people were established on adequate holdings under satisfactory conditions, and it turns out that they had under the previous unreformed law been able to accumulate sufficient capital to carry out permanent improvements and buildings upon which their property depended, I can only say these were not the people I described as requiring public money; they were people who were far better off under the old system than the people of Glasgow, described as living three or four in one room—people you do not propose to assist. What I stated in that debate—I have not referred to the speech, but, judging from the quotations given—was absolutely true so far as it referred to the people in the state of poverty described. Now I am going to do what the Lord Advocate did not do, and show how the Bill will affect that part of Scotland hitherto, like other parts of the civilised world, left to the working of ordinary tenure under private ownership. I can quite understand Socialist support being given to something in the nature of State ownership, but this Bill has the unique peculiarity of offending every canon of legislation any human being may hold from the extreme of doctrinaire individualism to the extreme of revolutionary socialism. There is no responsible statesman, politician, or theorist in the country who will not be offended by the provisions of the Bill. Let us examine it, not as the Lord Advocate did, in relation to that part of the country where exceptional legislation exists. You cannot introduce this for the Lowlands of Scotland only; if you introduce it there you must introduce it into England; it is not a Scottish Bill at all. It is Scottish because a clause at the end declares it shall apply to Scotland. In that narrow and technical sense I do not deny it; but it does not deal with any problem peculiarly Scottish, or any system of land tenure peculiarly Scottish, and if you adopt it for Scotland you must adopt it at once for the sister kingdom. I am quite aware there are hon. Members who would like that done. Let us realise then that if you do this for Scotland, you do it for England, and it is clear that, carried out on a large scale, it means an enormous pecuniary loss to somebody. You have farms in Scotland carefully mapped out to suit buildings of a certain size carefully designed to suit the farms. If you are going to divide the farms as proposed under the Bill, it is quite manifest that you will render wholly valueless a great part of the capital expenditure on these buildings. New buildings will have to be erected and there will have to be new fencing to divide your new holdings from the remaining parts. I am not sure whether English Members thoroughly realise this. The practice in the Lowlands of Scotland is for the labour required on the farm to find accommodation on the farm. There is a house for the ploughman in each farmsteading, as we call it in my part of the country, and accommodation for the labourers on the farm. Now it is quite clear that when you take away a fragment of the outlying portion of a farm, creating a new holding, you cannot compel the owner to give up part of his cottage for the new holding, and if you could compel him, the cottages would not be conveniently situated; new cottages would have to be erected for the new holding. It is perfectly manifest that this must involve a very great loss. But it is only a small part of the loss. Consider the position of the tenant you bring in, and of the landlord on whom you saddle him, under this experiment, as you justly call it, and see whether it is going to prove a success. We must assume that even if your bureaucracy that is going to take the management of the land out of the hands of the landlords, and manage all broad Scotland in a back room in Edinburgh—even if these gentlemen are far abler and far more competent to carry through this impossible task than we have any right to suppose, we must still take into account the possibility that they will make mistakes. Even Lord Carrington, the model landlord, made a mistake. He told the House of Lords, I think, that he had on one of his properties seven persons who took small holdings. These holdings were not suitable, or the men were not suitable, and, as Lord Carrington expressed it, these "seven sportsmen" had to go. Very well, then, there may be sportsmen in Scotland as well as in England, and when your Scottish sportsman has to go, or wants to go, or fails to observe the conditions which you impose upon him by this Bill, what is to happen? Lord Carrington's seven sportsmen failed to make a living out of the small holdings which he had provided, and, I presume, he either turned them out, or politely told them that the sooner they went the better. I assume that he resumed the holdings and turned them to some better use, or, more probably, added them to a farm or turned them to some other suitable purpose.

MR. WEIR: Or deer forests.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In Lincolnshire? I hope Lord Carrington did not lose much by his seven sportsmen. But when this Bill passes, and you make small holdings in the Lowlands of Scotland, and in one of these small holdings a man feels that he cannot make them pay, you still keep him there whether he likes it or not. He wants to go; the landlord, seeing the land deteriorating before his eyes, wants him to go, but your bureaucrat of Edinburgh, said, "No, not at all. This gentleman has borrowed £500 of us to equip a holding which we now think we ought never to have given him; but he did borrow the money, and there he must stay until he has paid it." That in another country would be described as a "servile condition." Supposing he does go, and the land is left, as it would be certain to be left under these circumstances, in a very bad condition, what is the landlord to do? He cannot add it to another farm, because that is against the Bill. I presume it would not be easy to find another tenant: at all events, it is not very probable that he would find one. He is not allowed, as I understand, to cultivate it himself, and if he is allowed—it is rather obscure in the Bill and I cannot make out where he is—in any case it is very hard to make him cultivate it himself, and this land is lying there getting worse and worse, and without a tenant, until the gentlemen in Edinburgh can make up their minds what ought to be done with it. They who have got all Scotland in their hands, small holdings in every direction of every kind, obliged to settle every species of difficulty, are brought in, and they have got to deal with the situation. I do not think this describes adequately the position in which the unfortunate landlord will be left; because who is going to be liable for the £500 which the ex-tenant against his will borrowed from the gentleman in Edinburgh, which he cannot pay because he is bankrupt, and which ought never to have been put into the holding if the holding was not suitable? I suppose the Government mean to come down on the landlord for it. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will tell me now across the floor of the House who will be liable in that case for the debt due to the country?

MR. SINCLAIR: I do not follow the right hon. Gentleman's argument.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The evils which follow from this state of things are very far from being exhausted by the account which I have given. Now, the hon. and learned Gentleman—I do not know whether he will be more successful than the Secretary for Scotland in following my view—has dwelt at length upon the fact that no landlord is going to be injured by this Bill. I am not going here to express any opinion as to that, but I think even the landlord ought to have justice done to him; or, at all events, if you will not do him justice, give him a clear percentage of justice, a plain fraction of what is due to him, so that he can count upon it. What I am going to say is not purely from the landlords' point of view or the tenants' point of view, but from the point of view of the agricultural system which you are going to set up. You are forcibly introducing into Scotland, against the will of landlords, this new system, and how will the landlord regard the new tenant? How can he do otherwise than say "Here is a man foisted upon me by three gentlemen in Edinburgh who know nothing about my estate; they cut a bit off one of my farms, and if they do that they may greatly injure it."

Mr. SINCLAIR: They would have to pay.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, for the farmer's injury.

Mr. SINCLAIR: They might have to pay for the injury.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: They have to pay the value of the injury. Suppose they do. That adds to the cost of the holding, a fine illustration of what I have been saying. That shows how expensive the system will be, but I am trying to deal with the frame of mind, first of the landlord in his new relation to his tenant, and then with the frame of mind of his new tenant. The landlord says: "This man has been forced upon me. He is not a tenant I desire to have, nor is he paying any rent agreed upon between us. He is not a welcome addition to my property; I am sorry he is there, but I must see that he pays the rent and does not deteriorate the farm more than I can prevent. I am in no fiduciary relation to him at all; I am not a partner with him as I am with my other tenants; it is not my duty to provide him with a permanent capital as I should do for my other tenants. It is not my business to take him into co-partnership in the general interests of the work on my estate." How does the tenant look upon his landlord? He is not a man to whom he can go for assistance in a difficulty. He has been foisted upon the landlord at a rent fixed by the State. He cannot go to the landlord and say "I have had a bad season. Won't you reduce my rent; won't you give me back a percentage; won't you defer the time of payment?" The landlord would say, "I have done that to all my tenants with whom I have had any free business relations; but you, my friend, have come here on a valued rent, at your own will, and against my will; go to the gentlemen who put you here. They have put themselves in the position of being your landlord. Let them give you the relief, which, if I were your landlord in the true sense of the word, I would gladly give you." Are the gentlemen in Edinburgh at liberty to give him the relief? If the tenant cannot pay the rent the landlord can hold him to every farthing of the bargain, and out he goes then and there. The landlord is merely an inspector who is always bullying him if there is any sign of his farming his land in an inexpedient manner, who is collecting his rent to the day and on the day, and who has the right to walk and shoot over the land when he likes. I do not think the relations between these two people are what, I am thankful to think, are the relations between landlord and tenant all over the Lowlands of Scotland at the present time—relations in which there is mutual service, mutual satisfaction, both standing by each other in good times or bad. Of course, occasionally there is sometimes inevitable difficulty and friction which, in business relations, cannot be wholly avoided; but, on the whole, nobody will deny that the relations are eminently satisfactory to both parties. You destroy absolutely all that, and I utterly fail to see what it is you are going to put that is more satisfactory in its place. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down attempted to minimise the enormous benefit which agriculture in Scotland now derives from the fact that on the landlord you depend for the provision of great capital expenditure on agriculture. Whether 20 per cent. or 30 per cent. is expended by the landlord, the expenditure is enormous, and it is necessary, and I venture to say that this will not be denied by any man who knows anything about agriculture. How are you going to provide for that expenditure in the future? The Solicitor-General tells us that the landlord's rights are in no sense damnified, and that among others of his great privileges he will have the right of mortgaging the property. The right of mortgaging your property is no doubt an interesting and a valuable right, but it loses most of its value when nobody will lend you money upon it, and it loses a great deal of its value if the rate at which money can be borrowed is materially augmented. The landlord, who says that he has nothing but his land, and that land is already mortgaged, but who is keenly alive, as most landlords are, to the duties and necessities of his position, will borrow money to carry out improvements and carry out farm buildings. If you are going to render every acre in Scotland less valuable than it is now, at least in the eyes of the lender, you are going to hamper this great industry in the most unnecessary and the most cruel way. We talk in this House sometimes as if the business of land was wholly different from other business. All business requires credit. Are you taking nothing away from a merchant when you take away his credit? You may leave him everything else in the world in the way of hard cash; but take away his credit, although it may be only a bit of paper or an unsubstantial belief about him in the mind of the lender, and you take away that which is almost more valuable than anything else he possesses. And to tell me that you do not injure the landlords when you make this stroke at their credit is to ask me to believe a thing which nobody would believe in any other business, and which I think is quite incredible in regard to the business of land. Perhaps it will be said, "Well, that is very unreasonable. The landlord can exact his rent; he can borrow upon that rent." Well, of course he can borrow upon that rent. But what you can borrow depends upon the view taken by the lender of your position, and the banks of Scotland and those who are prepared to lend money in Scotland are, unlike the Government and the majority of the House whom I am addressing, foolish enough to believe that land in Scotland will be better managed by the man who owns it than by the four bureaucrats sitting in Edinburgh, who cannot in the ultimate resort have that control which a lender upon security ought to have with regard to the thing which is the security. The inevitable result will be that difficulties will arise which do not affect the wretched dozen or two of small holders that you are going to create annually by this Bill, but which will affect the whole of Scotland and everything connected with agriculture. The Member for one of the divisions of Aberdeen who yesterday said he had himself been born on a small holding has obtained a great and creditable experience in other spheres as a merchant and a man of business. He supported the Bill. What would he think if the Government, or any other predatory body, were to take his capital, or part of his capital, and say, "I am not going to rob you of this, but I am going to treat it in the way I think best. You may differ from me, but on the whole I know what is best for the society in which you live; and I am going to take your capital and go into speculations of my own with it"? I think he would think that a very great outrage. It is what the Government propose to do with the capital of the landlord.

MR. SINCLAIR: No.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Does the right hon. Gentleman deny that?

MR. SINCLAIR: Certainly.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman denies that under this Bill the four gentlemen representing the Government can go to a landlord and say, "Give me 50 acres of this farm. You do not want to give it up for a separate holding, but I am going to take it; you do not want to let it, but I am going to let it for you." He does not deny that what has been put into that 50 acres by the landlord himself and his predecessors in title is as much capital as the capital which the Member for one of the divisions of Aberdeen puts into his business. The Government, then, take not merely a man's land, they take his capital, and they proceed to speculate with it in their own fashion. Well, I do not think that would be tolerated in any other department of industry. But that is not all. The Government, like other speculators, may lose. In some cases they are quite certain to lose. Then who is going to bear the loss? Are the people who forcibly take the capital from its true owner going to bear it? Why not? The whole loss is going to be put upon the unwilling partner to this iniquitous bargain. Nothing in the world, I think, can make this a justifiable proceeding. By all means expropriate the landlord if you think the land can be better used; by all means, if you dislike peasant proprietors or small holders, keep the land in your own hands. There is no difficulty in getting land; but supposing there was not any of it in the market. The Government, at the death of each successive owner, exact something like one-tenth the value of the land by way of death duties. Give the landlord the permission to pay his death duties, or part of his death duties, in land, and you will have more land than you know what to do with. When you have got it—and nobody can describe that as spoliation and robbery—then, if you approve, as I approve, of small holders, and if you desire to multiply them as I do, then you can use the land for that purpose. If you think that land should be State property, you can let the State manage it and bear the loss upon it. That is a plain, statesmanlike procedure. But what the Government are doing is the most foolish of all things. They are, for a very small practical result, going to make an enormous and devastating change. They are going to apply £60,000 a year to these holdings, and to create about 100 holdings a year in all Scotland. In order to obtain that relatively petty result they are going to shake to its foundations the whole credit of Scottish agriculture. They are like people who should raise a dam across a river for the purpose of irrigating some small field, and congratulate themselves upon the increased productiveness, when by that very operation they have flooded and rendered useless thousands of acres behind. That is the true parallel of what the Government are doing. [Cries of "Oh."] If they were sincerely engaged in the task of increasing the number of small holdings, they could do it without destroying credit, without committing the gross injustices involved in the very framework and texture of this Bill. They do not choose to do it in that way, and I am bound to say, after the speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman who spoke this afternoon, that they show a determination to appeal to prejudice in this matter. All the right hon. Gentleman's allusions to deer forests and overcrowding show it. What have deer forests and overcrowding got to do with the holdings in Fife, in Berwick, and in Ayrshire? They have nothing to do with it, and you are going to interfere with the whole industrial system of that country, and prospectively with the whole industrial system of England, in order to produce a scheme which will destroy the friendly relations between landlord and tenant, will turn the tenant into an often unfortunate holder bound to his holding, and the landlord into a mere collector of rents. By this Bill you are destroying the great capital expenditure upon land which now exists. In doing so, the Government do not merely do an injury to the landlord, they do not merely violate every principle with regard to the equitable treatment of property; they do not merely throw over every canon of legislation which has been accepted by their predecessors, but in my judgment they inflict an irreparable injury on the very class they desire to serve, the agriculture labourer and the small holder, who are the only excuse for this wild and infantile experiment which the Government intend to make.

MR. SINCLAIR: In the speech which he has just delivered the right hon. Gentleman has made certain charges against those responsible for the introduction of this Bill, and he has described the Government and their supporters in this respect as rushing to their ruin and the ruin of their country. The right hon. Gentleman has also referred to the brilliant speech of my right hon. and learned friend as being applicable only to the Highlands. It is not difficult to produce evidence to show that the evil which we seek to check is just as rife in the lowlands of Scotland as it is in other parts. The right hon. Gentleman really before he discusses this Bill, if I may say so with all respect, should make himself acquainted with what the undisputed facts are in regard to depopulation in other parts of Scotland. There is no part of Scotland in which depopulation is so bad, and so extreme, next to the very north of Scotland, as in the southern counties—in the Galloway district and the Roxburgh district—composing the Border parts.

I will give you a little more evidence on this point. Talking of the urban problem, which is the largest problem in the south of Scotland, and the one which is more important and more immediate in the south of Scotland, though I did not follow his argument the right hon. Gentleman appeared to argue that the more large farms there were and the barer the country districts were of population, the better it would be for the country. He denied that small holdings could be any remedy for the depopulation which went on round about towns. I gather that he means the south of Scotland. There are two ways in which small holdings, if there is anything in experience, will help that problem. In the first place there are men in the towns of Scotland who have worked all their best days upon farms, and when they have come to their ripe experience could find no opportunity of investing their savings in the occupation to which they have given their lives. It is these men who without hope and without career too often, drift into the towns, increase the competition for labour in the towns, and swell the difficulty with which municipal reformers have to deal. May I read to the House a short quotation which will perhaps give the right hon. Gentleman a little more information as to the condition of farm labourers in all parts of Scotland? This is the opinion of an unprejudiced observer — the opinion of a man sent over by another Power, and ordered to report on the opportunities for the purchase of agricultural implements in Scotland—the United States Consul, Mr. Rufus Fleming. Remember this is all the more important and valuable in that it is incidental to his inquiry as to the market for farm implements. He says—

> "It is a curious fact that in an overpopulated country—I speak of the United Kingdom as a whole—the demand for farm labourers is always greater than the supply. The conditions of country life in Scotland for the labourer are not as severe as they were some years ago—at least this is the testimony of students of social problems—and the pay of the farm worker (I refer to male and not female labour,the latter commanding from$2 to $2·50 a week, without board or allowances) is probably better than that of any other class of unskilled labour. Not that he receives more money than any worker in another unskilled occupation, but his wages in money and its equivalent are higher. The average wage of a farm hand is $5 a week, including his allowance of potatoes and rent of house; in addition, he has the use of a garden, which means much to him, as it materially reduces his living expenses. Yet there is much more discontent among the farm hands than in the various trades in the cities or among the urban day labourers. As soon as they accumulate a little money they emigrate, many of them to become prosperous farmers in the United States or Canada. I have talked with farm hands on this subject and have found that it is the hopelessness of the struggle in which they are engaged that makes them discontented. By no possible thrift or effort of their own can they ever acquire title to or possession of a foot of ground, and they are always looking forward to the day when they can go to the United States or a British Colony and get an opportunity to work for themselves. The unstable character of farm labour is much more noticeable in some parts of Scotland than in others, this class being relatively the smallest and the least dependable near the great manufacturing and mining centres, where they are tempted to give up farm work for other occupations in the vain hope of bettering their condition and prospects."

I wish to impress upon the House that these men whose whole experience has been gained in farm work have no opportunity of investing their savings in the bank they know best. They have no opportunity of applying their knowledge, and by the universal testimony of farmers in Scotland there is not only a scarcity of labour on farms, but there is also no opening for those labourers. That is one way in which we can benefit the urban districts by checking the flow of these men to the towns. Let me put to the House another consideration, which bears on this matter. It is a very good test of a social reform to inquire what the influence will be on the character of those whom it seeks to better and to help. Could there be anything worse for those men than to know that there is no hope and no possibility of their making a home for themselves and their children in the country districts? Could there be anything less likely to retain them here than that they should be without hope as to their future? You may spend money on education, you may preach co-operation and agricultural organisation to your heart's content, but you will never have any harvest from your efforts until you give men in Scotland security of tenure, which shall give them hope, which shall bring the possibility of bettering their condition to their knowledge, which shall stimulate their efforts to thrift, industry, frugality, and economy, and which shall educate them to endeavour to better themselves in the hope of raising themselves and their families to improved conditions. But there is another way in which the urban problem may be helped by this reform, and it is this. The country districts in Scotland and elsewhere would hold twice the people they do at present. I know that a great deal is said about Scottish farming, and I have more than once in discussing this Bill paid a tribute to Scottish farming; but is it entirely satisfactory? Is it not a fact that in the last thirty years rents have fallen something like 30 or 40 per cent.? Are you willing to acquiesce in that? Look what foreign countries are doing in this respect. Falling prices affected them as they did us, but they are making a determined and organised effort to make up their leeway. [AN HON. MEMBER: Protection.] If you will allow me to give my explanation I will do so. The hon. Member says it is "Protection." It may and it may not be protection. There is one thing you must take into consideration. There are two things which they have done in those countries which we have not done. In the first place, they are working on the basis of security of tenure. You cannot find a single country which is prospering agriculturally which has not a system of security of tenure. It may be ownership, or it may not. The characteristic of the system is that there is security of tenure. I am aware of the right hon. Gentleman's fondness for ownership. I admit that in some cases it is ownership, but it is security of tenure. That is the characteristic I wish to see introduced into our legislation. There is another thing which they have in foreign countries. We are all lamenting here the difficulty of the position in which agriculture finds itself. This Bill is not solely for creating small holdings. It is a Bill which is intended to benefit the whole of the agriculture of Scotland. It is intended to give the people of Scotland the opportunity of making a resolute and determined effort to grapple with this problem. In such countries as Denmark and France, and others which could be named, there is another characteristic to which I should like to draw the attention of the House, and that is this. They have an organised administrative body looking after agriculture. They have brought to the greatest perfection the administrative side of the State's responsibility towards agriculture. What have we done in this country? The crofter experiment which has been alluded to has been in operation for twenty-one years, and it has prospered in spite of every obstacle where there is security of tenure. Why has not the Government which has been in power endeavoured to build upon that basis a prosperity which might be quite possible in the future of the crofting districts? If we were to spend in Scotland according to the proportion in which they spend in Denmark, France or Switzerland, a shilling her head of the population per annum in assisting agriculture, great results might be achieved. If we did that in this country we should spend £200,000 a year in regard to Scotland alone. This Bill seeks to give Parliamentary powers which shall be exercised for the general encouragement, supervision, and superintendence of agriculture in Scotland from beginning to end. My hon. friend the Member for the Leith Burghs spoke of various problems of Scottish agriculture which should be dealt with. He spoke of intensive cultivation, co-operation, agricultural education, and afforestation. These are essentially local matters which should be dealt with locally, and Scotland should have a chance of developing her resources in those directions. It is sometimes forgotten that the development of those foreign countries to which I have been alluding is a perfectly recent development. It has taken place within the last forty years. It was very much stimulated by a fall in prices similar to that from which this country has been suffering. In those countries they have availed themselves of measures for making up the leeway, while we have omitted to do so in this country. I say that if we really develop those special forms of farming we shall do a great deal more for the prosperity of the rural districts and in consequence for the prosperity of the urban population. We are told about poultry and eggs coming from France. Is it recognised that there are poultry schools in France for educating and organising the people? Let me say a word as to whether the holder is bound to his holding. I have a paper which shows that in Argyllshire there are in each parish four or five men who, since the passing of the Crofters Act, have risen to occupy farms at a rent of £70, £80, and £100 per annum. I will not dwell on that point any further; but I have said enough to show to the House that there is another side to the question than that presented by the right hon. Gentleman—that agriculture is suffering from no special malady. Agriculture in Scotland is suffering from want of care and effort and organisation, and, if the depopulation of the rural districts is a real evil, I hope the House will look with sympathy on the efforts which the Government are making now to focus public attention upon it. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman would wish me to go through the scheme of the Bill again. It is in print; it has been explained several times to the House. If I have failed to understand the hypothetical cases put by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, it is because he led the House through such a maze of suppositions that I did not know at the end of it whether I was on my head or my heels. The right hon. Gentleman's first supposition was that the Agricultural Commissioners appointed under the Bill would be a set of lunatics. It is quite impossible to argue this or any other Bill except on the footing of common sense. I say that if it is assumed that every member of the Land Court or every Agricultural Commissioner has no knowledge of the subject with which he has to deal, and is animated by prejudices against landlords as a class, no scheme will work under such a measure.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I really attribute to the right hon. Gentleman's officers all the virtues.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I will not labour the point further, but will say a word about the compulsory clause, to which the right hon. Gentleman confined almost all his criticism. I say that there must be a compulsory clause, and if the right hon. Gentleman will examine it he will see that it is hedged about with an infinity of safeguards, and that the compulsory clause is not the whole Bill, but is only intended to be used in extreme cases. There is nothing in this Bill, bar this compulsory clause, which is not drawn directly from the experience of the working of two Acts of Parliament—the Crofters Act of 1886, and the Congested Districts Board Act of 1897. The arguments of the right hon. Gentleman against the proposals in this Bill might just as well be turned against the machinery of those Acts which were carried under his administration. This Bill is not only in accordance with Scottish experience, but in accordance with Scottish opinion, notwithstanding the opinion of the Chamber of Agriculture, and the Highland and Agricultural Society of Scotland. It is in accordance with Scottish opinion as expressed in the evidence taken before the Committee on Small Holdings of last session. Let me read the evidence which came from, not the Highlands, but from another part of the country. Mr. G. W. Constable of Traquair in Peebleshire, was asked what class of men would come forward asking for small holdings, and he replied agricultural labourers and shepherds; these men could not get a sufficient number of small holdings. Again he was asked if there would be a difficulty in regard to putting up buildings on the small holdings, and his answer was that there might be a difficulty, but it could be overcome if the landowner got the money a little cheaper than now. Mr. Constable went on to say that the applications were not for the purchase of small holdings, but for hiring the land, and that he was rather against any general scheme for purchasing the holdings. I noticed that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition was very careful not to propose any alternative scheme to that proposed in the Bill. If the right hon. Gentleman admitted the evil I would like to know what his remedy is.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR was understood to say that he was in favour of establishing a system of purchase.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Then I say that to establish purchase is a much more serious departure than the scheme of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman is in favour of purchase in defiance of Scottish opinion and Scottish experience; but I put it to hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House who know Scotland well, whether there is any evidence of a general demand for purchase on the part of the tenants of Scotland. [Ministerial cries of "No, no."] Nobody who knows Scotland can controvert that statement. The suggestion of purchase has always come, in Irish as well as in Scottish experience, from the owners of the land. Let me put the case perfectly fairly. In a holding there are two capitals, the tenant's and the owner's, and the demand is that both should earn their due interest. The demand for a fair rent really means that the landlord's interest shall not be increased at the expense of the tenant's, and when a tenant quits his holding, there must be a Land Court to assess the value of the interest he wishes to withdraw from his holding. It is a very short step from that to the Land Court in the Bill. It has been shown by my hon. and learned friend the Solicitor-General for Scotland and my right hon. friend the Lord-Advocate in their masterly speeches, that the Bill only takes away from the landlord the right of arbitrary eviction, Accepting the desirability of agricultural holdings legislation, the Bill only goes one step further, and says that the tenant must have more security than in the past. A great deal has been said about Irish experience before 1881. The demand of the Irish tenants was not to own their holding, was not for purchase, but for security of tenure. It was not until 1883 that Lord George Hamilton brought forward a Motiontto develop the purchase clauses of 1881, and it was seconded by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, not from the Irish tenant's point of view, but from the landlord's. That was strengthened by the subsequent introduction of the Ashborne Act. The true lesson from Irish experience is that the two systems cannot live together. If you introduce the purchase system, you are bound to wreck and throw into utter confusion the landlord and tenancy system. An attempt was made under the Congested Districts Board to create 200 or 300 small holdings on the purchase system, but the reports of the Board show that the tenants preferred to be tenants, and not to be purchasers. It is to avoid that confusion that the Government have adhered in this measure to the system which has hitherto prevailed in Scotland, the system of landlord and tenant. If you give security of tenure you bring about a revolution in our land system. It is essential, moreover, to recognise the change in the character of farming. There is a passage which was quoted the other day from Burke, in which he says that it is futile and mischievous to treat agriculture as you would not treat any other industry. The farmer is becoming more and more scientific and it is not now merely a question of reaping a cereal crop. The Agricultural Holdings Act and its amending Acts have done more and more to develop branches of agriculture in regard to which security of tenure is demanded. Plants and trees have a longer life than a season, and therefore the tenants' capital is becoming year by year more and more difficult to extract from the holding. It becomes therefore more and more essential to give protection to the man who is engaged in agriculture. Do you think that you could get a man to build factories and workshops in towns who has not security of tenure in regard to the land upon which he builds them? If that is not so, you will not get a man with brains and capital to put those brains and capital into land unless you give him the complete security which is enjoyed in town by those who erect manufacturing premises. I am not going to labour the point, because it cannot be denied that security of tenure is essential if you wish to develop the land.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I put a question which has not been answered. Will the right hon. Gentleman say on whom, in case the tenant closed the tenancy, would fall the liability for the rent-charge on the estate on an improvement made against the will of the landlord on a holding he had no wish to create?

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is placed on the estate of the landowner as a loan.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: In other words the landowner has got to pay.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes, and I will tell you why. He has got to pay. The hypothesis upon which hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite argue about this Bill is that it is what they call a devastating procedure. Now what is the procedure and what is the system which it seeks to set up? I invite the right hon. Gentleman to read the evidence of Sir Arthur Ord, a landowner in the North of Scotland, who is satisfied with the effect that this system has had on his estate. It is quite impossible for us to meet the right hon. Gentleman on common ground unless he will credit us with the intention of aiming at preserving the landlord's property. We spend money upon it, we make roads and fences and gates upon it, and all that expenditure must improve the landlord's property. [Cries of "No, no."] Surely that must be so, but I will not trespass any longer on the time of the House. I will only say that Parliament and this House is committed by its legislation of fifteen years ago to the principle that there is an evil which we ought to mitigate. Fifteen years have been lost, because nothing has been done in this connection. In Prussia during the last fifteen years 10,000 small holdings have been created to try to meet this evil of depopulation, and I hope that Parliament will no longer delay in trying to apply it to Scotland.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS (Birmingham, Bordesley) said that the Bill was of interest to English Members because it was probably upon the lines of it that the English measure would proceed. He had listened to the replies which had been made to the speeches from the Opposition side of the House, and the more he had listened to them the more he was puzzled; although he was pleased with their style and their ability, there was no real explanation of the Bill. The Secretary for Scotland, in the same way as the Lord-Advocate had done, had drawn touching pictures of rural depopulation and of overcrowding in towns. But he had failed to tell them wherein under this Bill there existed any remedy for those evils. He was astonished at one thing. The right hon. Gentleman had alluded to Continental countries and had gone to them for examples of the benefit of security of tenure, leading the House to believe that the security of tenure in the Bill was something of the same kind and would have the same advantages as the security of tenure in the countries which he had named. The right hon. Gentleman knew very well, however, that there was nothing in the system of land tenure on the Continent which gave security of tenure in the manner sought by this Bill. The security of tenure provided abroad was based upon ownership, the most powerful incentive of all for a man to put his brains and capital into a holding. A witness before a Committee on which he had sat had been quoted against purchase, but why did not his right hon. friend go through the evidence and give the opinion of nearly all the principal witnesses both from Scotland and from England examined before the Committee? If he had done so, the House would have found that, while admitting the difficulties of purchase, the witnesses recognised and expressed strongly the opinion that the ideal way of settling the question was by purchase. He would only quote one witness from Scotland, and he did so because he was a representative man and was amongst the very ablest who were before the Committee in connection with agriculture. It was the evidence of Mr. Isaac Connell, Secretary of the Scottish Society of Agriculture. He believed that Mr. Connell was one of our best authorities and he would put him against Mr. Constable. He and others spoke of the great and ideal advantage, while always admitting the difficulties, financial and others, of ownership as against tenancy. He was gratified to see the position which this question had attained. It ought not to be a Party question, but unfortunately it had been made so. He had held for nearly half a century that it was a national requirement that a solution of these evils should be found, and in his opinion it would only be found in the restoration of the condition of things in England when it had its own yeomen and peasant proprietors tilling the soil which they owned. If this Bill had gone in any degree as a practical step in that direction it would have had his hearty support. Land-hunger, however, would not be satisfied in any way by the Bill. It was, to put it shortly, a retrograde measure. It proclaimed to every agricultural labourer in England and Scotland that there was no chance, whatever his desire might be, for him to possess the bit of land he tilled. At the Holborn Restaurant the Prime Minister had made touching references to deserted villages, the depopulation of the countryside and the terrible state of the agricultural labourer, but he had not pointed out in what manner this Bill provided a remedy for that state of things. The right hon. Gentleman had characterised it as a "crusade of land reform." It was in fact a crusade against peasant proprietary and occupying ownership of all kinds. If it became law the great ideal of a man tilling his own land must be put aside for ever. The right hon. Gentleman had directed a little chaff against the Liberal Unionists, but with regard to the land question he forgot that barring the small results which were the effect of the Local Government Act of 1904, there was not a labourer or small holder in England but had got his holding so far as legislation went as the result of Unionist legislation. The right hon. Gentleman had said that every demand for land had met with a blank denial and that therefore the Government went for compulsory powers, "swift, simple, and extensive," and he had quoted a long list of cases which Lord Lansdowne had described as samples. Cornwall was one of the cases cited, but when the matter was brought before the Cornish County Council they knew nothing about it. There had never been any inquiry, any committee formed, or any steps taken in the matter. Yet Cornwall was quoted to prove the assertions of the Prime Minister. There was plenty of land to be had in almost every part of England. The Small Holdings Act of 1892 provided that the county councils should set up advisory committees for the purpose of establishing small holdings. Some of them had done so, but had done nothing else. The Act of 1892 had been deliberately ignored by the great bulk of the county councils of the country, and the statement made by Lord Ripon in another place that the Act was a complete failure had been made on most imperfect information. Where it had been put into operation it had been a complete and unqualified success. Why had the Act failed to so large an extent? The first reason was that the bulk of the county councils did not want small holdings, and the second was that the Act contained a provision that 20 per cent. of the purchase money was to be paid down by the people who wished to become small holders. That provision had been found to be a fatal barrier to the acquisition of a small holding. There was a small Bill before the House on the previous Wednesday to do away with that barrier, which Bill would have received its Second Reading in five minutes, but for the fact that the Government blocked it. The Second Reading of that Bill would again be moved to-morrow night, and had the Prime Minister been present he would have appealed to the right hon. Gentleman's kindness of heart and his interest in the agricultural labourer to let it go through. He was amused at the conditions demanded by those who expressed themselves favourable to small holdings. The land must be rich; it must be situated near a town; the labourer must be almost perfection and possess qualities found in no other class. Anyone would think from these grandmotherly regulations that there were no rights on the part of the labourers at all. There was a colony of small holders in Worcestershire which, if it were 1,000 miles away, would be visited with interest because it had solved this great problem. But that colony has violated every one of these requirements which were thought to be imperative to assure the success of small holdings. The land in that case was originally poor; it was expensive, it cost £40 per acre; it was fifteen miles from a town, and it had a number of other disqualifications. The experiment was tried under the most unfavourable circumstances, and the result had been that for twelve years there had been a colony there of thirty-two families, happy and contented, in a state of continued prosperity, paying their instalments regularly, without a penny of arrears. Although those instalments were based on the too high basis of 4 per cent., which meant an annual instalment of about £2 per acre for forty years, these small holdings had proved a complete success. That colony was formed under the Act of 1892, to the everlasting credit of the Worcestershire County Council. One of the colonists was a fendermaker from

Birmingham, and another a nailmaker from the neighbourhood. But all had been successful. One man had paid up his debt to the county council in ten years, though he had forty years in which to do it, and had saved enough besides to buy land outside the estate. And let the House remember that this estate was formerly a farm which could not be made to pay. He found, from some rough accounts that he had looked over, that one man on the produce of 29 acres of land had received in hard cash £600 the year before last, and that during that year he had expended on the land in labour £240, in addition to the labour of his own family. What was the general result of that experiment? Twelve years ago that parish was a poverty-stricken, God-forsaken place. Now it was full of able-bodied men living in comfort, with houses and homesteads such as no one in this House would think it a hardship to live in. There was not an able-bodied pauper in the parish. All were ratepayers instead of being on the rates; all had their horses and carts and were bringing produce into the manufacturing districts to the value of thousands a year. There were solved the questions of old-age pensions, pauperism, housing, and all these subjects which they had to consider, but in the case of these men on the land they provided for their families, and if they died, their holdings could be sold or devised, or could be disposed of to other cultivators, of whom there were plenty in the field. There was no risk to the State; indeed, in the county of Worcester the county council was making a small profit out of them, a thing they ought not to do. The council had often got over the bar of poverty by questionable means, though he hoped that they were legal, by postponing the requirements for payment of the initial sum for some years, and they delayed the transfer of the land accordingly. What he wanted to urge on the Government and the House was that there was room in this country for 100 or 200 colonies. Such colonies would do more and more to supply some portion of the £60,000,000 sterling spent on articles of food now imported from abroad. What we now got from across the Channel could be supplied by these 100 or 200 Catshills estates. All this was done without the intervention of the law courts, without litigation, and without complicated machinery. It was done by the same process as obtained in every country in Europe, and it had never failed. Let them suppose that the Board of Agriculture purchased 400 acres of land, and divided it into small holding of five to fifty acres, with homesteads, if they were required, all being self-contained holdings. There would be no difficulty; within a week every one of the holdings would have been applied for the applicants being suitable men, who had been in the country, and who would like to go back to the country if they could. He had received, not scores but hundreds of letters from gardeners, caretakers, hauliers, coachmen, etc., employed in the towns, most of whom had saved a little money. These men had originally come from the land, and they would be delighted if they had such an opportunity afforded them of returning to it. There was a practical solution of the difficulty. That was the real "back to the land"—honest purchase, on easy terms, and repayments by yearly instalments. He could multiply instances, but he preferred to give one typical example which had stood the test of twelve years experience. What was the secret of the success of a colony like that? It was ownership. Unless Members admitted the magic of ownership his arguments fell to the ground. Ownership was the secret, it did not matter whether it was ownership of a house, a horse, or land, or farm, or wife, or child, or anything else; ownership was deeply implanted in human nature, it brought out the very best of a man's powers, and disclosed the highest possibilities that were in him. The Prime Minister had said that there was no idle land on Lord Carrington's estate. He commended the action of Lord Carrington in his treatment of Crown lands; he was worthy of every commendation for what he had done in that direction. But with regard to estates which had been referred to honour was due to the hon. Members for South West Norfolk, North-West Norfolk, and South Suffolk, who had formed themselves into a syndicate in Lincoln. Some of them were opposed to him in politics, but he gave them the most ample credit for what they had done for the benefit of the public by their private action. These Members and the Member for Spalding had taken 800 acres of land from Lord Carrington; they had become security for the payment of the rent and the observance of the covenants, and had been at the expense of adapting the land for small holdings. These they had let, and had taken every responsibility with regard to them. They were entitled to the highest credit. It was said that the men would prefer tenancies. But he had talked with them individually and collectively, and he found that there was not a man of them but would, if he could, have terms which made him owner of the soil and the holding. In one instance, he said to the tenant—"If money were supplied to you by the State to enable you to acquire the land, would you prefer it?" The man replied—"No such luck as that." He said to him—"Are you aware that in Ireland that has been done?" And the man replied in a pathetic way, "Ah, but we are only Englishmen." He commended that to the attention of the Government when they were talking about tenancies. It stood to reason that ownership was preferred. At the end of twenty-one years where were the tenants? The land after it had been intensively cultivated and its value increased perhaps 20 per cent. went back to the owner. And what became of the man's family? They were nowhere. To such a man what would be the value of ownership compared with a tenancy? The question of dual ownership had come up. It was the worst form of tenure that the mind of man had ever conceived. It was an invention by Mr. Gladstone in 1881; there was nothing like it in the civilised world. Mr. Gladstone thought he had discovered something, and he had discovered something in regard to which every prophecy made at the time, as to the evils which would flow from the system, had been more than fulfilled. The Lord Advocate in a very specious way had told them that it would have worked well but for the enormous amount of litigation, the enormous law costs, the enormous expenses, and he knew not what. Aye, but he had forgotten to mention that all this paraphernalia was part and parcel of the system, and was the result and necessary accompaniment of the system. The right hon. Gentleman had read a letter penned by Mr. Bailey, but as far as the argument was concerned it fell to the ground. The system damaged landlord and tenant alike, and created intolerable hardship, litigation and expense, which had to be remedied by the Act of 1903 at an enormous cost. As had been pointed out, if this Bill became law, future Chancellors of the Exchequer would have to find a hundred millions to remedy its effects. Denmark had been mentioned. It was only of the legislation of the eighties, carried on through the nineties and up to the present time—legislation on the lines that he was advocating—that Denmark, from the terrible state in which she had been, was now experiencing the benefit, and it was that legislation which had made her what she now was. The difficulty could only be solved by a system of purchase. It had been said that there were difficulties in the way of the present Government adopting purchase, because there were about sixty Socialist Members of the House of Commons and three members of the Government in favour of the nationalistion of the land. He would remind the House that Socialism was not to be put down by ridicule or chaff. It was a policy attractive in its character, having for its end a complete change of society as it existed at the present moment. It was a great pity to attempt to treat it in any other way than as the serious matter it was. The Socialist Members of the House would support this Bill, not only because it went a great way in the direction of Socialism, but because they objected to the multiplication of the owners of land or indeed of any other class of property, and because they naturally wanted the number of landowners to be as few as possible. The House was aware that the system advocated by hon. Members below the gangway had been tried in Germany. From Karl Marx and his successors there had been an onslaught on the rural districts of Germany intending to capture them and the House knew that they had been defeated. In fact their leader had acknowledged his defeat. Did the hon. Members below the gangway doubt that? If they did he would remind them of the last General Election in Germany, for before that contest the Socialists were something like eighty strong in the German Parliament, and they came out a mere remnant. And why? Because they were met by 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 peasant proprietors and occupying owners. Those were the people who defeated them. The circumstances in this country were totally different. In England Socialism had every chance, because they had destroyed the only natural barrier against Socialism. In this country there was a proletariat, a wage-earning class with no stake in the country. Socialism not only in this House, but throughout the country, was increasing by leaps and bounds. [Cries of "Oh, oh." and laughter.] Hon. Members opposite might laugh, but if they inquired they would find that what he had stated was correct. There was only one barrier to Socialism, and that was the creation of a peasantry by purchase and re-sale, and that was what he was advocating. They would not accomplish it by such rubbishy Bills as the measure under discussion, which were like pills to cure an earthquake. It was a serious matter with which they had to deal, and there was only one way of dealing with it. Whatever might be thought of it this country stood in a dangerous position, and it had now to make its choice between the increase of Socialism and the restoration of a peasant proprietary and occupying ownership generally. There was no other choice. The question of depopulation had been referred to. Did the House realise what that meant? Did they think this country could do what no other country had ever done? Could this country remain in the front rank on a ruined agriculture and a depleted population? If so, it would be a new era in the history of nations. What was this depopulation? He had worked out the figures himself, and he found there were forty-two counties the rural districts of which had less than 200 men, women and children to the square mile. In the rural districts of twelve of those counties there were less than 100 persons to the square mile, and in three there were only fifty human beings to the square mile. This country was a desert, or at any rate was rapidly becoming one. The last census showed that 77 per cent. of the whole population were urban, leaving only 23 per cent. to the rural districts. If they deducted from that total the residential population, those engaged in sport, those who worked in the few factories in the country districts, and others, they would realise what a small proportion was left for agriculture. There was nothing like it in the world. One hon. Member had stated that this depopulation had been going on in every other country just the same as in England. Yes, but there was all the difference in the world between migration to the towns in a country where the rural population was 50 or 60 per cent. of the whole and the migration in England where the rural population was depleted to almost vanishing point. In some districts they could hardly find a young agricultural labourer. The economic question was a secondary matter. They did not think of economic questions when they built an ironclad, because it was wanted for defence. They should not forget that the rural population must be the first and second line of defence of any country in time of stress. With regard to the wealth of the country, the thousand millions per annum of which an hon. Member opposite had spoken might in time of stress as well be a thousand million paving stones. If they were exporting wealth it was bad enough, but when they were exporting the manhood, the very best of our working men, and particularly agricultural labourers, it was a far more serious thing. With all due respect to the President of the Local Government Board, he contended that no Government should ever sanction such a state of things for a moment. They should look at the real wealth of the country in the form of its manhood, which was going from it. And lastly, the community had a natural right to demand that the land should fulfil its primary obligation, which was to produce food and other necessaries for the general community up to its utmost capacity. But this Bill operated in the opposite direction, because it set a premium on bad farming. They fixed the rent for seven years, and two or three gentlemen came down from Edinburgh to decide on the present condition of the farms and as to what the rent should be. Certainly if they saw a holding flourishing and in a good condition the chances were that the rent would go up.

*MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire) said that had not been the case under the Crofters Act.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS said he did not want to prove too much, but under those conditions the tenant would be likely to have the rent raised. But let the House suppose the land was badly farmed, or that in seven years the holder thought it wise to let his land deteriorate. The chances were that he might have the rent lowered. At any rate, it was an absolutely stupid position. If they adopted a system of ownership all these questions were settled, or to be more accurate, they would not not arise at all. He only wished that he could persuade the Prime Minister to withdraw this Bill and consider the suggestions he had made. [MINISTERIAL laughter.] There was nothing derogatory about that suggestion. All he wished was that the Government should reconsider the question in the light of experience, and in the light of the points raised in the discussion. If the Prime Minister would only do that he could assure him that he would be ready to give him all the credit, and he was sure that every man interested would give the Government their most hearty support.

MR. A. DEWAR (Edinburgh, S.) said they had listened to a most interesting speech from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bordesley, and it was exactly what they would naturally expect from one who had devoted such a large share of his life to the study of the subject. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman had never gone to Scotland to consider the conditions there, and to help in the solution of their rather peculiar problems. He was more than disappointed that the right hon. Gentleman did not answer some of the powerful observations of the Lord Advocate. He did not know that he was right in saying that he was disappointed, for probably there was no answer to what the Lord Advocate had said from the Scottish point of view. He was glad that they had the right hon. Gentleman with them at least half way. The right hon. Gentleman agreed that depopulation was an immense evil; he knew well of the congestion in every considerable town both in England and in Scotland; and he knew that it was directly traceable to the want of facilities for settling on the land. He was glad of these admissions, because it would be remembered that the Leader of the Opposition had denied that proposition and had devoted the most important part of his speech to contending that no amount of people they got back to the land would in the slightest degree relieve the congestion in towns.

*MR. JESSE COLLINGS said he was not responsible for the opinions of the Leader of the Opposition on this question. He himself held fifty years ago the opinions on this question which he held now, and he had never ceased to advocate them.

MR. A. DEWAR said that was exactly what he expected to hear from the right hon. Gentleman. That was the reason why they welcomed him as an expert on the subject. He would like the right hon. Gentleman to put his leader right. The right hon. Gentleman had defended ownership, remarking that there was magic in the word. He and his friends from Scotland advocated State regulation of land tenure. The magic in the word ownership was simply that the holder retained and secured for himself the fruits of his own labour. That was exactly what State regulation gave them. To understand the problem they must look at it from the labourer's point of view. Was it not a fact that the agricultural labourer was getting more wages, in Scotland at least, than ever before? He was also getting cheaper food than ever before. [AN HON. MEMBER: "No."] He was talking of Scotland, and with great deference to the hon. Member he maintained that wages were higher and food cheaper, but nevertheless the agricultural labourer would not remain on the land. Why? It was in vain to tell him that he ought to be satisfied with no more than his parents had. He had had education for thirty years, and that was an unsettling element. He rejoiced in that, because until a man was dissatisfied with his present position, he lacked the incentive to improve it. People said that education had educated the agricultural labourer out of his sphere. It was true, and he rejoiced in it. The labourer would not stay in the country working for £1 a week. He had asked why labourers left the country districts, and he had got the same answer from everyone. It was to better himself. He wanted in fact to be his own master. He did not want to own land if he could be his own master without owning it. If they could secure to him the fruit of his labour, and make it quite certain that when he died his children would get the benefit, he would stay in the country and no attractions of the town would have any allurements for him. They heard from those who took a superficial view of the case that it was the public-house, the theatre, and the well-lit streets that attracted him. Did anyone ever hear of a man in the rural districts who had a stake in the country—say a joiner or a blacksmith—state that the city had any attraction for him? It was the agricultural labourer who had no more hope of owning land than of becoming lord of the manor who packed his knapsack, sought the glare of the town, and swelled the ranks of the unemployed when he got there. The Government had a plan for dealing with the agricultural labourer. The Government plan was that if a man had a small holding already, he could be secured in it under this Bill by going into the Land Court and stating that he wanted to be so secured. When registered both landlord and tenant would acquire certain rights provided for by the Bill. The main argument against the Bill was that its proposals were unfair to the landlord, because they took from him, without compensating him, the rights over his property which he had at present. What right had the landlord now which he would not have after the passing of the Bill? Under the Bill not only would the landlord have a voice in choosing the man he desired to be tenant, but he would have the assistance of the Commission in finding a good tenant. If they assumed, as the Leader of the Opposition seemed to do, that the Land Court was hopelessly ignorant and determined to ruin a holding, of course the holding would be ruined and no intervention of any Government would ever save it. But if they took the analogy of the Crofters Commission, they would find that there was a supply of reasonable, skilled, and honest men in Scotland, who would do fairly and justly by both landlord and tenant. He thought it might be assumed that the difficulties which the right hon. Gentleman had imagined would not really arise. Parliamentary interference with private rights in the public interest was no new doctrine. That was shown by what had been done under the Coal Mines Regulation Act, the Factory Acts, and other statutes. The Crofters Act, which was the working model of this Bill, had transformed the Highlands. It had been suggested that there was something peculiar in the crofter population. If there was, it was their exceptional industry, pertinacity, and ability to live under a peculiarly inclement sky and on an unkindly soil; but to suggest, as he had heard it suggested, that there should be one law for the hills and another for the plains in Scotland, was to suggest what was not true. There was no difference in the conditions so far as the Highlands and Lowlands were concerned. It was true that some of the crofters had erected their own buildings, and a great deal had been made of that. Had hon. Members ever examined the buildings in which crofters lived? What was usually found was one small building, a few feet wide, with one small door in the centre. At one end the crofter and his family slept; and at the other end, without any division, the cow was stalled. That building was erected by the crofter himself from the plentiful crop of stones that he found on his croft, and was held together by turf and mud, while the roof was thatched with heather from the moor. It was under these conditions that the Crofters' Act was passed. The crofters were in a state of rebellion. They refused to pay rents; Government messengers were sent to collect the rents and they were deforced. The crofters were sent in batches to Edinburgh to be tried and were condemned to imprisonment, and then went back to their homes as hero-martyrs. The Government introduced the Crofters Bill and it passed through the House and became law. It acted like magic. Hon.

Members should never forget that the Crofters Act was exactly this Bill; and the Crofters Act having run for twenty-one years was now approved of by both landlords and tenants and by the whole community of Scotland. He asked the House in all earnestness, why should they not apply the same principle to the whole of Scotland? If a fair rent was good for the Highlander, was a not fair rent good for the Lowlander? If fixity of tenure was good for the Highlander why not for the Lowlander? He admitted that it would have been a hard case to argue for fair rent and fixity of tenure had they not had the model of the Crofters Act; and he hoped that they in Scotland would really be allowed to manage Scottish affairs in their own way. From his own experience he could say that Scotland was eagerly anxious on this matter. It was true, as the hon. Member for North Ayrshire had said, that the Chamber of Agriculture had by a majority voted against the Bill; but it was notorious that the Chamber of Agriculture was composed of the landlord and large tenant class. His point was that the small holders and the agricultural labourers were in favour of the Bill. The landlords and large tenants were as much afraid of this Bill as they were, without cause, of the Crofters Act. The towns of Scotland were more overcrowded than any other towns in Great Britain. Of course he knew that the evil could not be cured in a day. The right hon. Member for South Dublin had admitted that in Lowland Scotland there was better agricultural skill than in any other country in the world. Why had they failed in scientific agriculture in England and not in Scotland? Why should Scotland supply England with Archbishops and Bishops and men for every department of public life; and why should Scotland have made a comparative failure in one department of agriculture as compared with Denmark? Denmark was half the size of Scotland, with half its population. Denmark had not as good a climate as Scotland, because of the sand-storms to which it was exposed. One hundred years ago Denmark was in the same position as Scotland was now so far as the conditions under which the rural population lived. All that was altered now. A hundred years ago Denmark had exactly the same system of land tenure as existed at present in Scotland; but the marvellous change which had taken place in that country was due to the security of tenure which the small farmers had, and to co-operation. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman opposite would admit that if security of tenure was not given, at the end of a lease up went the rent. This Bill was not an attack on the landlords. Far from it. Scotsmen did not want to get rid of landlords as the hon. Member for Ross and Cromarty seemed to imagine.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): Nothing of the sort; what I appeal for is justice to both the landlords and the crofters.

MR. A. DEWAR said he apologised to the hon. Member if he had misrepresented him. His hon. friend would agree with him that the tenant farmer did approve of the landlord, who had many admirable qualities, who supplied capital for application to the soil, and had an educative influence on his tenants. But there was one thing which the tenant dreaded and that was the power of eviction, as anyone could imagine who had seen a poor man flitting, on a bleak November day, with his cart of furniture. He appealed to hon. Members who were not familiar with Scotland to consider seriously before they opposed this measure which would give the Scottish people a chance of helping those who could not help themselves, and of managing Scottish affairs in their own way.

*MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs) said he opposed the Bill because he thought if the Government were going to make experiments on agriculture they should pay for them. He would not oppose anything that would do away with the depopulation of the rural districts or the congestion in the towns; but he did not think that the scheme of the Bill would go far towards securing either of those objects. He quite recognised that people in overcrowded towns suffered in physique and to some extent in morals; but whether any new scheme of land-ownership in the country would counteract the effect of theatres, churches, public-houses, in fact the whole life of the town was very problematical. What he objected to most was dual or triple ownership. Practical people would hesitate to buy land; prices would go down and the interest on bonds would go up. He suffered already from that himself to the extent of hundreds of pounds. What was more important, in his opinion, was that the Bill was likely to destroy the good feeling that existed between landlord and tenant, and the old incentive to a man to improve his property, which was the greatest joy a landlord possessed. He believed that the real desire of the Government was to give the landlords good tenants; but how could they guarantee that the next generation would be as good farmers as their forefathers. He was told that there was a crofter who had benefited by the Crofters' Act who was now the owner of two public-houses in Glasgow. That was not the sort of crofter he would like to see on his property. Another point was as to fixing of rents at the end of every seven years. That had had a most disastrous effect in Ireland; and every Irish landlord would say so. It was patent to him that if there was any chance of the rent being lowered at the end of the period of seven years, the tenant would be tempted to allow his land to run down. His own tenants' rents were low enough, but he did not want any opportunity being given to the Government to make them lower; and the seven years re-valuation would have that effect. Again, why should this Bill apply only to Scotland and not to England? Why should one system apply to Berwickshire and another to Northumberland? If the Government were really *bona fide* in regard to this matter why did they not carry out the proposals of the Bill for Great Britain as a whole instead of limiting them to Scotland? Another question he wished to ask was why should this benefit stop at the £50 limit. It might be £100 next year and later on it might be £1,000, and then, when they had fixity of tenure for every farmer, it would destroy the check upon bad farming which the present system had, roughly speaking, maintained. The truth was that the Government were desirous of trying experiments with somebody else's money. He did not accuse the Secretary for Scotland of deliberately trying to impair the prosperity of the country, or of endeavouring to make bad blood between landlord and tenant, but if the right hon. Gentleman had deliberately intended to do so he could not have gone a better way about it

*MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton) said that most of those who had spoken on this subject had done so from the point of view of those who represented the agricultural interest or county constituencies, but he wished to say a few words as one who represented an urban and largely artisan constituency. He would venture to say as a town Member, that anyone familiar with the terrible overcrowding which existed in their Scottish towns and in Glasgow more than anywhere else, would hold up both hands in favour of any scheme that would stop the terrible exodus which was draining the countryside and congesting the large centres of population. He did not say that this scheme, or any scheme, could remove all the bad economic conditions which existed, but he knew many of his own constituents who would never have left the country districts in which they were born and gone to Glasgow if this Bill had been the law and if under it the men had had a direct interest in their district and a small holding out of which they could have supported themselves. The provisions had been criticised with great severity, but the Bill merely proposed to apply, with certain alterations and improvements, to the whole of Scotland a system which, under the Crofters Act, had worked very well for over twenty years in certain districts. The system had been applied to what were known as the crofting areas of Scotland. But after all, those areas had been selected somewhat arbitrarily, and it was difficult to find any great difference between a crofter in Ross-shire and a crofter in Galloway. The Crofters Bill had worked well in the Highlands, and it was proposed to extend its provisions to the Lowlands. It had been said that it was doubtful whether it would work well in the Lowlands, but it was always problematical whether a Bill would work well or not. Those who supported this measure were, however, entitled to pray in aid two things. In the first place, the provisions of the Bill had already been a success for a substantial period of years in other parts of the country, and, in the second place, there were conditions which existed in the Lowlands and not in the Highlands which would probably conduce to its successful working. In the Lowlands they had bigger and better markets than in the Highlands; moreover the wages of agricultural labourers were better; and what was of enormous advantage for the working of small holdings they had better means in the Lowlands than in the Highlands of communication and transport from county to county, from town to town, and from village to village. The objections urged against the measure were twofold. In the first place, it was said that they ought to adopt a system of purchase; but whilst purchase might be a very good thing for England or Ireland he contended that it would not be a good thing for Scotland. They did not believe in purchase in Scotland. But if this Bill passed into law unamended, the House would not have put into operation any provision which would prevent a man from purchasing if he wished to do so, and they would have taken a great step forward by securing that a fair rent should be fixed by an impartial tribunal. The Bill did not negative future purchase, the objections to which were that it would involve a heavy drain upon the Exchequer. They had not found in the past that the Treasury was always ready to come to their aid in regard to questions of finance, and, human nature being what it was, if small proprietors were brought into existence suddenly and in large numbers it was to be feared that they would act very much as large proprietors had done, and if by means of purchase they acquired holdings they would be tempted to use the property as security for debt. They had tried purchase in Scotland and found it expensive as compared with the system proposed by the Bill, and the proceedings in regard to purchase had been more complicated and in addition not satisfactory. Surely these were practical objections against introducing purchase into Scotland to-day. It was simpler to proceed along well established lines which were economical and had succeeded already, than to introduce a new principle. When they had a system which had been working successfully for a long period of years they should not change it for another, the working of which in other countries had showed it to be unsatisfactory in the highest degree. Then they were told that the Bill introduced the principle of dual ownership. But he was unable to agree with that contention. What was the essence of all ownership? It was the power of legal disposition. If the Bill passed into law the landlord would still have the full power of the legal disposition of his property; but the tenant was secured fixity of tenure and a fair rent, which did not detract anything from the ownership of the landlord in his land. The Bill did not introduce dual ownership in Scotland inasmuch as the tenant could not give, sell, or bequeath any interest which he might be said to have in the land. He remembered that there were many other Members who were interested in the subject, and, therefore, he would not be justified in intervening longer between them and the House, but, as a Member who represented an artisan constituency, he wished to put their point of view before the House of Commons. It was no doubt an evil thing for people to leave the country districts, but the evil was aggravated when they gravitated to the urban centres. He believed that the Bill would do something to keep in the country and on the land people who would otherwise go into Glasgow and Edinburgh and increase the congestion in those cities. Surely it ought to be the aim of legislation to keep the strong and virile minded denizens of the country out of the bad and insanitary conditions which prevailed in the slum districts of large cities and to preserve the full manhood of the race. He, therefore, appealed to hon. Members from the point of view of the toilers in great cities to try to do something to stop the migration into those cities from the country districts—a migration which by setting up competition caused to be discharged crowds of workmen whose only crime was that they had grey hairs. Young men crowded in from rural districts and displaced men who were at work in the towns, and he pleaded as an urban Member that this Small Landowners Bill should be passed into law.

*MR. J. F. MASON (Windsor) thought they were all agreed that steps should be taken to retain our rural population upon the land, and if he criticised the Bill at all it was because he thought that before proposing a remedy they ought to diagnose the disease. He had seen in Perthshire, on an estate over which he had acquired shooting rights, ruined houses, farms and cottages, which sixty years ago were tenanted, but from which the inhabitants had entirely disappeared. When however they came to consider the causes of depopulation they could not leave out of account the fact that the prices of agricultural products were very different to-day from what they were sixty years ago. That, combined with the burdens that the land had to bear, the large amount of land which had gone out of arable cultivation, and the increasing use of machinery, had a good deal to say, in regard to the depopulation which had undoubtedly taken place, and it was hardly fair to assume that that depopulation was entirely due to the lack of small holdings or was to be overcome by providing a larger number of them. He ventured to think that the depopulation was rather because of pressure from within than attractions from without. What he meant was that the depopulation was caused rather by the depressed condition of agriculture than by the attractions of the town. But he wanted to deal with the question of small holdings, and he was of opinion that there were two or three classes of holdings of that character, which it was distinctly desirable to have in our midst. The first was the class of small holdings which were in the neighbourhood of a town or large centre of population and which were devoted to intensive agricultural cultivation. He thought that the number of these holdings should be increased as far as possible and that the only limit should be that the number should not be so great as to affect the market upon which their prosperity depended. Another class was the small holding which was in the occupation of a person who also had some other business or employment. They were limited. They must be scattered in the neighbourhood of larger farms or they must be in the neighbourhood of small towns where their owners could pursue some other trade than that of agriculture. But when they came to the third class, the holding on which the owner was to devote his whole time to cultivating, he had grave doubts of the economic soundness of carrying this movement too far. Whether he was right or wrong in that, he was convinced that the way in which it was proposed to deal with the matter by this Bill was the way to make failure practically certain. There was a chance that small holdings might be made successful, but if dealt with in the way proposed by this Bill there could be only one result. Land could be held in two ways. There could be an owner occupier, a system which had great advantages. In the first place, a man who owned his holding felt that all he did upon it and what he put into it was in his own interest, and so used his best endeavours to turn the holding to the best account. But there was also the disadvantage that he had to lock up a certain amount of capital in the land which, were he only an occupier, he could devote to the cultivation of the holding. The other form was that of landlord and tenant, but he believed that that form could only be successful so long as there was perfect freedom between those two men to fix the conditions of the tenancy and to fix the rent at such a figure that both the landlord and the tenant could anticipate that the rent would remain constant and be neither increased nor reduced in the future; that the tenant should know if he cultivated the farm well his rent would not be raised, and also that if he culitvated badly he would not be able to obtain a reduction. It was a great thing for a farmer to feel secure in his farm, but it was equally important that he should feel certain that his rent would remain a consistent factor in his out-goings. He believed that what in the Bill was called fair rent was bound to lead to careless and bad farming if the tenant could look forward to a reduction of the rent at the end of seven years. Another great disadvantage he saw in the fair rent scheme was very important. It was quite evident that so long as a landlord had a tenant of whom he approved and who had agreed in all the terms of tenure, he would do what he could to keep that tenant. The custom in the country was that the landlord did the repairs and maintained the buildings and so forth. One of the results of his not doing so was that he would lose his tenant. But when under the terms of this Bill a landlord had a tenant foisted on him at a rent which he did not consider adequate, what was there to induce him to keep the buildings in repair. Was it not possible therefore that they might drift into a condition of things where the landlord having no interest in the land, would not do more than he could help, and the condition of the farmer be worse than it was when he started? If they once started this system of fair rents and it led to what he believed it would lead, namely, to the landlord no longer doing what he was willing to do to-day, he believed it must inevitably fail and they must fall back on a system of purchase. If they endeavoured to deal with this matter by means of State credit it must be by a system of purchase. He did not believe they would get the best result or in fact any result from these small holdings unless the men became owners of their holdings. He was far from believing that it was desirable in the interests of the country at large that the land should be held in so few hands. He believed it would be to the advantage of the country if the land were divided among a greater number of individuals; but if they were going to deal with it in the manner proposed the right hon. Gentleman could not say the Scottish did not desire to purchase. The desire was to carry out this scheme on the cheap. The Bill provided £65,000 a year for the starting of small holdings. Possibly with great economy in the administration of the Act it might lead to 100 small holdings a year being created. Would not that lead to a block such as had arisen in Ireland where the operation of the Land Act was also blocked by the finance? The money provided was ludicrously small, and showed that the Government did not contemplate great things but only experiments on a small scale. If the Government had any confidence in their Bill they would spend a much larger sum than was contemplated. The object everybody had in view was to increase the rural population, and the number of owners on the land, but he ventured to say, whichever the object was, they must always bear in mind that it was for the benefit of the State. This legislation was not brought in with the view of benefiting any individual, but solely of benefiting the State. If the State desired a change of this kind in the interest of the State it was the State that must take the risk of failing—must find the money and take the responsibility of these small holders being reduced in circumstances in the course of some years if the scheme was a failure. Surely if the scheme failed these people who went in with a small amount of capital would be found at the end of a generation in a worse condition than when they started. Another reason why the State should purchase property and hand over the ownership entirely to the new occupier was that unless that were done they would throw upon the landlord the burden at the end of the period, if the experiment turned out a failure, of receiving back these holdings deteriorated and with buildings upon them utterly unsuited to any other form of cultivation. He ventured to impress seriously upon the Government the desirability of considering whether some further form of purchase could not be introduced into the Bill and whether ownership of land could not be invested in the occupiers.

*Mr. J. D. WHITE said that many Members must have observed in the House the enthusiasm with which the Bill had been received by Scottish Members. The reason for that was not far to seek, when they considered what the conditions had been in Scotland in recent years. Some mention had been made of deer forests, and he would like to call attention to the fact that the area added to the deer forests had been considerably over 50,000 acres a year for the last few years. In addition, the land on the borders of them, and in other places, had been going out of cultivation; the land sustained fewer people, and the people were steadily drafting into the towns. His hon. friend the Member for Huddersfield showed, in a very striking article which he wrote about eighteen months ago, that the overcrowding in Scottish cities was very much greater than in any of the cities of England. For instance, in Manchester the proportion living under overcrowded conditions was one in sixteen; in Leeds one in ten; and in London, one in seven; while in Edinburgh, it was one in three; and in Glasgow one in two—or half of the population. That had been accompanied naturally by physical degeneration and by conditions of life which were a disgrace to the country. It had told on the death-rate among infants. Last year he put a Question as to this, and was given certain statistics. There would be an outcry through the land if the death-rate among the calves and the lambs was anything like the death-rate among the children of the poor in our large cities. It was also noteworthy that emigration from Scotland had been steadily increasing. In 1899, the emigration of Scotsmen, of men of Scottish nationality, was under 5,000 a year. By 1902, it had risen to 9,000 a year; in 1904, to 19,000 a year; and the number of emigrants from Scotland last year was over 32,000. Only a few days ago an article in a leading Scottish newspaper on this subject showed that during the first few months of this year the proportion of increase of emigration had not only been kept up but had been increased. The emigrants were from many parts of Scotland. It must be remembered also that they were the young and not the old; the vigorous and not the feeble; the enterprising and not the backward. This emigration was a very serious thing for the homeland. It skimmed the cream from the top of the population, instead of draining the dregs from the bottom. Far be it from him to close any opportunity for his countrymen and countrywomen to do as well as they could for themselves in Canada or elsewhere, but he urged that they ought to develop the resources of their own native land and in that way improve the prospects of future generations. Some hon. Members had spoken as if the Government had taken some new departure in this Bill. They had done nothing of the kind. They were proceeding along the lines of the Crofters Acts, which had worked so excellently for twenty years. Something had been said on the other side about the Highland line. This was not quite the same thing as the line of the crofting counties. Let them take the crofting county of Argyllshire, close by which was Buteshire, a non-crofting county where there were many crofters. A crofting county did not mean a county where there were crofters, but one of the counties specified in the Act. How was it that a system which was applicable to Argyllshire, was inapplicable to Buteshire, which was close by? If this system was applicable to Argyllshire, why was it not applicable to Dumbartonshire? Why was it applicable on one side of Loch Long, and inapplicable on the other side? The Government had started out with security of tenure, and it was security of tenure which was the foundation of everything. If they were to have a population settled on the land, it was not enough to say, "The landlords will treat you and well, the factors will treat you well, and if you will lay out money on your holdings you really can rely on their kindness and generosity." They wanted a business basis, and the business basis was security of tenure; that a man settled on the land should continue to have a fair rent, and should not have his rent raised against him because of his improvements. These were the fundamentals of the system. An hon. Member on the other side had spoken as if the fair rent was fixed for ever. But that could not be so; the conditions must vary from time to time, and the rent not only must be started fair but must be kept fair; and the only way to do that was to have an impartial tribunal which could regulate rents at stated periods, say every seven years, so as to secure fair play to the tenant. That seemed the better idea, and better than compulsory purchase. If hon. Members opposite acknowledged the existing evils and were so wedded to compulsory purchase, why had they not during their long term of office taken a single step to remedy the evils by introducing that system? Purchase involved heavy expenditure, whereas the system proposed by this Bill called for no elaborate financial transaction at all. The tenants would pay for the land out of the profits which they made from it. From the point of view of the State, it was a most economical system, and it was a system of simplicity; from the point of view of the tenant it was a good system. The right hon. Member for the Bordesley Division of Birmingham attributed to ownership the sense of security which was felt by the holder of the land. But that sense of security was not due to ownership but to the fact of security of tenure, and where they gave that security of tenure, he believed that it was a far better way of dealing with the matter. He would also point out that it was the best way to keep the tenants out of the hands of the money-lenders, because instead of a man spending his money on the purchase of the land, it enabled him to spend it on improvements of his holding and so enabled him to use the land better than before. The curse of peasant proprietors in almost every country in the world was that if there were two or three bad seasons, they got into the hands of the gombeen man, and they then had dual ownership in its worst possible form. There was no dual ownership in the proposal of the Government. Ownership remained in the landlord, and the tenant had security of tenure. What did the landlord want more than that? He received a fair rent for the land and for what he had put into it. He might want to do what he liked with his own; he might want to turn the tenant out without any reason given, but they maintained that he should not be allowed to do so. That was the only way they interfered with the rights of ownership, namely, that the tenant should have security, and that he should not be turned out without good reason from the house which he had built and the holding which he had brought into a state of cultivation. Hon. Members opposite had spoken of the purchase of the land at its market value. He knew of various lands which produced practically nothing and were returned for assessment at practically nil. But the moment they wanted to purchase those lands for building cottages or for small holdings, then prices became prohibitive. He believed that the Bill would never work properly until they had a system by which the value for rating and taxation was also made the basis of the purchase price. Once they had that, he believed they would be able to get land at a fair price. The present conditions in this respect were another objection to purchase just now. Even in renting the land they would in many cases have to pay too much for it, and he absolutely declined to be a party to any system of purchase until they had a simple and automatic means by which, if they purchased at all, it should be at a fair and not at an exorbitant price. He hoped that before long they would have a Valuation Bill for Scotland under which land would be assessed at its market value. Last year he remembered speaking of Scotland in regard to legislation as the Cinderella of the session. He was glad that the Government, by promoting Scottish legislation on the most important of Scottish questions, were doing something for Scotland which that country had long needed.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said the hon. Member who had just sat down had spoken very feelingly upon the subject of emigration, and he had pointed out that a large number of people were leaving Scotland. It had also been stated that a great many of those who had emigrated from Scotland were a class who could afford to travel as second-class passengers. Under those circumstances he did not think the argument that those people had been driven away because they could not obtain a living in Scotland held good. Probably they had left Scotland because they saw a better chance of getting on in another country.

Mr. J. D. WHITE said his argument was that they wanted to give them that better chance in Scotland.

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY said the hon. Member could not have it both ways. They could not support this Bill by the argument that the well-to-do class preferred to emigrate.

Mr. J. D. WHITE said he did not say that they were a well-to-do class. What he said was that some of them were well-to-dc

Colonel KENYON-SLANEY said the hon. Member had asserted that a considerable number of the emigrants from Scotland were able to go out as second-class passengers. That was proof positive that they were not amongst the very poor class. He would like the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill to tell him how it was, if the Crofters Act was supposed to afford an argument in support of this legislation, that the population in the crofter parishes fell from 158,000 in 1871 to 142,000 in 1901. Did a diminution of 16,000 persons show that the Act had tended to retain the population on the soil?

MR. THOMAS SHAW suggested that the right hon. Gentleman should give the figures for 1885–86 instead of for 1871.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY regretted that he had not those figures.

MR. THOMAS SHAW said the proper point to start from in drawing a contrast was the legislation which began in 1886.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY asked whether it was a fact that since the Act came into operation the population had diminished. The silence on the opposite bench was ominous.

MR. SINCLAIR said he had not the full figures before him; but it must be borne in mind that if the decrease outside the crofter parishes was greater than the decrease inside it would show that the Crofters Act had been of service in staying the rate of decrease.

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said it had been declared over and over again that the Crofters Act had kept the population on the land. Right hon. Gentlemen opposite could not say that the population had not decreased since that Act was passed, and therefore he was entitled to say that they had broken down in that part of their argument. Did the right hon. Gentleman deny that proposition?

MR. SINCLAIR said that a Return for 1907 showed that in non-crofting counties there was a decrease in the number of small holdings in every county but three, while in the crofting counties there was an increase in every county but one. [AN HON. MEMBER: But what about the population?]

COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY said his point was whether there had been an increase in the population. Had the population been strengthened or diminished by the operation of these Acts? Hon. Gentlemen opposite could not quote the Crofters Act as having done anything to stem the depopulation of the rural districts. That fact being acknowledged—[MINISTERIAL cries of "No"]—he would proceed to discuss the Bill. With reference to what had been said about security of tenure he wished to remind the House that a long lease was a near approach to security of tenure. The longer a tenant had undisturbed possession the nearer he approached to security of tenure. It had been denied that there was anything like dual ownership under this Bill or anything that was unfair to either the landlord or the tenant. The effect upon his mind of the speech of the Secretary for Scotland was that he had a less clear understanding of what was proposed at the end of it than at the beginning. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the Bill was the outcome of Scottish experience and Scottish opinion. Personlly he had doubts upon that point. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had made a mistake in that matter. Then the right hon. Gentleman stated that one of the objects he had in view was to secure more scientific agriculture throughout Scotland. Again he was startled. He had always understood that there were perhaps no more scientific cultivators than those in the best parts of the lowlands of Scotland. He thought some of them would be startled when they were told that they were not scientific, and that the small holders proposed to be established were to conduct agriculture on scientific lines of which they were ignorant. He wished to call the attention of the House to the position in which they stood. There seemed to be a general idea that there was on that side of the House opposition to small holdings. How could that be when they were going to support an Amendment which in its essence approved the setting up of small holdings? Turning to the provisions of the Bill, he pointed out that there was a large number of small holdings even in the most highly farmed portions of Scotland, while in Scotland as a whole small holdings constituted a large proportion of the occupied land. Towards stemming the exodus from the crofter districts the Crofter Acts had done nothing. He wondered whether the earnest advocates of the Bill realised the responsibility they were undertaking towards the new type of tenant it was proposed to create. These new tenants were to be invited to invest the whole of their savings in the holdings, savings which had been effected under the present system, and if the new system did not prove successful the new tenants would in many cases be in an almost hopeless position. If the result was unfavourable the Government would have ruined these men, and their responsibility would be very great. All experience showed that the pursuit of agriculture was a very hard life at the best, and under the conditions proposed it would probably result in failure. What would be the effect of the measure in those cases, and they would be of frequent occurrence, in which a landlord, acknowledging that small holdings were useful, had set them up on his own estate? He had equipped them and attached to them a certain portion of land in order to make the experiment, if possible, a success. He had rented the land at a low rent. There were many cases in which the land attached to a small holding was rented at 4s. or 5s., while if the same land were attached to a large holding it would be rented at 12s. or 13s. If when the Act came into being that land was taken over at a rent of 4s., would it be fair to the landlord that for all future time he should only receive that amount for it, when, if he had not created the small holdings, he could have got 12s. for it? If hon. Members would think over that, they would see that there was an element of great unfairness in it, and he believed it was one with which they would hardly like to associate themselves. The Solicitor-General for Scotland had said that no landlord would be any worse under the Bill. It reminded one of the Jackdaw of Rheims:—

> "But what gave rise to no little surprise,
> Nobody seemed one penny the worse."

He was afraid that was not quite true. Let them take the case of a landlord who had let a 200-acre holding. He had arranged his rent on the ground that the 200-acre holding was to continue in the tenant's occupation on a long lease. Down came the Commissioners and took away 50 acres. Would any man who had practical acquaintance with the buying and selling of land say that the whole value of the estate was not distinctly lowered by the fact that that land had been taken off that particular farm? The Solicitor-General for Scotland had tried to persuade them that there would be no loss under the scheme of the Bill. But what was to happen when the whole system of culture on the holding was changed by the new tenant? That system of culture might not agree with the buildings already on the farm and might only be an experiment on the part of the new holder. Who was to be damnified by the expense caused by the change of culture? Was it to be the owner of the soil? The whole scheme of the Bill was bad, as always happened when a system of dual ownership was set up. He thought that the Lord Advocate had allowed his sentiment to overshadow his common sense. He only wished that the right hon. and learned Gentleman had been in the position of a landlord; then they might have had the advantage of a grumble from him against the provisions of the Bill. And he would remind hon. Gentlemen opposite that there was among some of those who were inherited owners of old estates a strong feeling of responsibility as to the duty they owed to the people who lived on the property, and they tried to do their level best to act up to that duty. But this Bill would make it impossible for them to carry out that which was to them a sacred trust and charge. [Ironical MINISTERIAL cheers.] It was a trust which had been carried out on the whole fairly and well; and he could afford to ignore the cheap jeer of hon. Gentlemen opposite. Then the Bill must diminish the general prosperity of the agricultural districts by withdrawing the large expenditure now willingly spent upon them and in the equipment of the farms by the owners of the land. A calculation had been made by a high Scottish authority that the money so withrawn would amount to £10,000,000 a year. That amount of money was spent not only on actual agricultural development, but on all subsidiary industries in the district. Again, the taxpayer had not been sufficiently considered. In order to spend £65,000 a year on an uncertain problem there would be in salaries an expenditure of £18,000 a year. A wiser plan of experiment would have been to adopt some measure for cheapening the transfer of land so that experiments could be tried on the land so acquired. The opposition was not to the setting up of small holdings, but to the system proposed by the Bill.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I fully recognise the temperate and reasonable spirit in which my right hon. friend has discussed this matter. If I were to find any fault with one portion of his speech it would be to say that he should not assume, as he does, that he, and perhaps his friends about him, know a great deal about this subject, while those on this side know nothing. It does not do to set up a monopoly even of information and experience in this House; and perhaps I may enforce that little injunction upon my right hon. friend by justifying the smile with which I received the statement that the effect of the Bill would be to prevent the expenditure of £10,000,000 per annum. Why, the whole rental of agricultural farms in Scotland is only £5,500,000. The whole rental of agricultural land in Scotland is £5,500,000. I am not accustomed to hear with a calm countenance the greater subtracted from the lesser. I must refer for a minute or two to a matter personal to myself. Some doubt has been thrown on a statement of mine in a speech outside this House, much alluded to by some of the speakers, as to the demand which I alleged existed for land for small holdings and houses, which demand I said in many cases had been met with a flat denial. It was said that there were many districts in which land had not been demanded for this purpose, or had been granted if it had been made. I asserted that there were many cases in which these circumstances did not exist. To tell me that there are others in which they do exist is hardly an answer. But the hon. Member for Ayrshire, reviving in this House some memories that I entertain of a letter in *The Times* yesterday morning, says that I ought not to have gone back to a report of 1895, when there was a more recent Paper submitted to Parliament. He objects to antiquated evidence; and I do not wonder at it, because for the last ten years, since that evidence came out, he and his friends have been responsible, and have done nothing to deal with the state of things which that evidence disclosed. But the Return of the Board of Agriculture which is more recent, was of a different nature altogether. The previous Returns, to which I referred and on which I founded myself, were a record of definite attempts made by the local authorities to obtain land, especially under the Small Holdings Act of 1892, whereas the Return to which the hon. Gentleman refers comprised a number of opinions expressed by gentlemen in different parts of the country who were called upon by the Board of Agriculture for evidence. I think it is better to go on the actually recorded proceedings of public authorities than on the mere opinions of certain gentlemen. The two things can hardly be put on the same plane; and I am not sure who these gentlemen are who gave these opinions. They are the correspondents of the Board of Agriculture in London. But how are they chosen? Who controls the selection? I do not wish to speak disrespectfully, but still the Board of Agriculture is more or less affected by the Minister at the head of it. [MR. WALTER LONG: No.] Then who does select these correspondents; because, judging from the opinions given in Scotland, I should doubt very much whether they are impartial, and, indeed, it would be very difficult to get any one who could stand the test of being perfectly free from prejudice and party feeling in the matter. But, however that may be, when I used the words the other day which have been quoted, I had in my mind not only the question of small holdings, but of land for allotments and other such purposes. This 1895 Return shows that 483 acres had been provided in eight counties, and that 650 petitions for small holdings had been presented in forty-one other counties which had acquired no land for the purpose. But I think the Return to which the hon. Member refers is a valuable report; and he was not at all exhaustive in his reference to it. In the introduction to this Paper there is a passage which, I fancy, must have escaped his notice. It runs—

> "It is possible, of course, that the apparent absence of demand may be put down, to some extent at least, to a recognition of the futility of asking for what is practically unattainable."

And again—

> "The majority of the correspondents, however, report that there is a demand for small holdings which is not satisfied for reasons which many of them specify. The belief that their provision would tend to keep the population on the land is explained."

What I said the other day was, not that there were no parts where any land had been granted, but that there were parts of the country where it had been blankly refused. I must say a word or two as to the evidence in this Report with regard to Scotland. Counties are specified where there is great difficulty in getting small holdings and allotments. In Berwick a great demand for holdings is reported. In Peebles small holdings practically cannot be got, it is said, because wealthy proprietors will not, and poor ones cannot, supply the necessary buildings. [Cries of "Why?"] In Wigton we are told that small holdings were at one time numerous, but they have been gradually absorbed in large farms. I need go no further to show that I was amply justified in what I said by the Report which the hon. Gentleman opposite preferred over the heads of the previous Reports, which were even stronger. Now, to-night we have had a version of this Bill given to us by the Leader of the Opposition. It sounded to our ears like a romance. At the head you have a body of corrupt, incompetent, possibly venal, and certainly bureaucratic gentlemen——

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I did not say incompetent or venal. I did say bureaucratic.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: If they were to do the things which the right hon. Gentleman imputed to them they must be both incompetent and venal.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: As the right hon. Gentleman makes the accusation against me I may say I suggested neither incompetence nor venality. I suggested nothing but that they might fail, as Lord Carrington admitted that he failed.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I stand upon "bureaucratic," at all events. There are a number of bureaucratic gentlemen in a back room in Edinburgh, from which vantage ground they proceed to disorganise the whole landlord class, and to menace the existence of every species of property in the United Kingdom. Incidentally they are to manage, as I gather, the greater part, in fact, the entire land of Scotland. Then you have on the other side the small holding, actual or potential, a perverted class of men, apparently, who are either bankrupt or going bankrupt, and wholly unfitted to cultivate the land, and yet foisted upon land quite unsuited for the purposes of small holdings, by this incompetent—by this bureaucratic body.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: That is not what I said. I have a right to say, all I mean to say, that the speech attributed to me by the right hon. Gentleman bears no resemblance whatever to what I said.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am a humble person, and I can only give the impression which the right hon. Gentleman's speech made upon me and my hon. friends around me. Now these unhappy men are tied down by virtue of an iron system of bondage called fixity of tenure, and they are tied to a barren and irresponsive soil. And, if I understood the right hon. Gentleman, they will, by the very nature of the case, or because they have suffered more acutely than the rest of mankind from the effects of the fall of Adam, be practically unequal to developing the land for the purposes of intensive cultivation. And to complete the picture, you have the figure of the patient and heroic landlord, with his estates torn from him and divided up among this riff-raff, compelled to accept the wretched rents and inadequate compensation awarded by the bureaucratic body, and forced to make good to the estate the liabilities incurred by the small holders. Even that does not complete the picture; but I will not pursue it further, it is so distressing.

What I think we ought to do in the face of that picture is to consider what under this Bill will actually happen. Let me say, first of all, that this Bill is not introduced, as my hon. and right hon. friends have made plain, in the air, without any experience. We have the experience of twenty years upon exactly similar relationships in the north-west of Scotland, where there has not been a hitch from beginning to end, where the landlords and the tenants are satisfied, and everybody is satisfied. We wish to extend those advantages further in that part of the country and to apply them to the rest of Scotland. But it is said the rest of Scotland is quite different. Is it different in any of these respects? To begin with, are there not men of the crofter class in other counties? There is exactly the same sort of thing in Aberdeenshire, where there are men indistinguishable from the so-called crofters. In the south, too, in the Stewartry of Kirkcudbrightshire, and even in Dumfries, there are men in exactly the same position. But if there were not, is this an unwholesome position that we create, is this an unwholesome way of dealing with the relations between landlord and tenant, and their relations to the soil? A good deal has been said about the feeling of Scotland. I believe that the feeling in Scotland is strongly in favour of this Bill, and we have every reason to know that it is. It is quite true that there have been some meetings of very big farmers and others in Edinburgh which have pronounced against it; but I have heard of a meeting of the Farmers' Association in a county not very far from Edinburgh, East Lothian, where approval of the Bill was moved by a Unionist farmer and seconded by a Liberal farmer, and where another Unionist gentleman who was present made a motion condemnatory of the Bill, but was not able to find a seconder. Among the class of farmers themselves there is no insuperable hostility to the Bill. I think it will be advantageous to consider what will happen under this Bill. From a certain village or parish there may be representations forwarded to the Commissioners that there is a very strong desire for small holdings, or a group of men may apply for small holdings. The Commissioners send one of their number down to inspect the locality. He interviews the men to see whether they are of a class likely to make good use of their opportunity. He then goes and interviews the landowner. I will assume the worst—that he finds the landowner is reluctant or recalcitrant. The Commissioner tries to persuade him, but failing in that, he proceeds to investigate personally the available ground, and he is able to select one or two spots the conversion of which into small holdings would do no harm to anybody, which would be conveniently situated and the land suitable for the purpose. He reports to his brother Commissioners, and they have a further inquiry. They also approach the landowner to see whether he will relent. I assume the worst case, that he does not relent. Then they proceed, as I understand it, to report that a certain piece of land is suitable and available for small holdings. Then they act upon that. Then comes in the Court—an altogether independent body—to fix the amount of rent that ought to be paid, and the conditions on which the land should be let. The Court fixes it. The landlord still remains displeased, but he cannot help himself; the Court gives its decision and the thing is done. I take the case of the first man. He has, perhaps, saved a little bit of money; he advances it, gets a further loan from the State, and proceeds to do such draining or building and so forth, and improving the land as may be necessary. But, then, we are led to believe by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, in his picture, that nearly all those concerned must be either rogues or fools or bears. The man takes to drink or evil ways, or through other faults wastes his money, and in a year or two becomes bankrupt. Supposing he does. What happens? His estate or

Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.

little farm would have the benefit of the lease he had obtained on a reasonable rent under the order of the Court; there is the house and the other things he has built and all the improvements he has made. Am I to be told that the property is to lie derelict because no one would take it? The right hon. Gentleman said the land might be unsuitable. If it was unsuitable ground it assumes that the Commissioners did not know their duty. I assume that they did know their duty and that it will be a good bargain for anyone to get this so-called derelict land, and there is no likelihood of any loss. The whole picture which the right hon. Gentleman drew was painted from his own imagination. But if it should so happen that in any one case there is a loss by this proceeding, then I am bound to say—I do not know whether it is provided for in the Bill—that in that extreme case the loss ought properly to be borne by the State. It would not be a great loss, and I think that would not be unfair. In all the cases we have had in the North-West Highlands there has been no such case as that. As I say, it is to imagine that the whole lot of them are incompetent. I venture to say they are not incompetent, and they must all have been incompetent if any such case as that could have arisen. There is the bugbear of the right hon. Gentleman I think pretty well destroyed. The one case that he dwelt upon culminated in this—the bankrupt tenant of a small holding, and who has to bear the loss. I have said that with all the safeguards that are provided, first of all by the Commissioners, and then by the Court, if any such case did happen, then I think the State ought to bear the loss. No one on the other side of the House is opposed to the idea of small holdings granted in a casual and benevolent way by the goodwill of the landlords. Nor are small holdings under the sanction of the State objected to. But they wish it to be done by purchase. In Scotland our Scottish experience has shown that the mode of purchase is extremely expensive, infinitely more expensive than our proposal. We have discovered that the Scottish tenants and the Scottish labourers, and others interested in the matter in Scotland, do not desire to have purchase; they prefer this other way of dealing with it. That is the foundation of this Bill; that is the common sense of the matter. We wish to increase the number of small holdings. The right hon Gentleman implies, in fact he does not imply, he said it, that any increase in the rural population would only intensify and aggravate the exodus to the towns; that the more you keep the people in the country the more they will want to go to the towns, and, therefore you are, I suppose, to leave them alone. I do not agree with him. Even if it were so, is it not something to open up a career and the prospect of a useful and happy life to hard-working men who are debarred from it by this unfortunate lack of land? I think that is an object which, if attained, would be of enormous benefit to the race, to the physical condition of our people, and to the community at large. Those are the reasons why we have introduced this Bill, and nothing that has been said in the course of this debate has proved to me that any other way that we could have adopted would be half so likely to be so efficacious as this.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 365; Noes, 126. (Division List No. 149.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair

Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A.(Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,Sir J.Williams(Devonp'rt
Benn, W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell,Sir J.H.(Essex,R'mf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner,Rt.Hn.SirJ.T.(Chesh.
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,Sir Wm.J.(S.Pancras,W
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W.H.(St.Pancras,N
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,John Deans (Fife,West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,HughCecil(St.Pancras,E.
Leese,SirJosephF.(Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever, W.H.(Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield,H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)

Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon,N
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H. M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E.(Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann, Sir C.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whiteley, John Henry (Halifax
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn (Carm'rth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughon)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood,Rt Hn.Sir Alex.F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J.(City Lond)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,Rt Hn.J.A.(Worc
Chance, Frederick William
Clark,George Smith(Belfast,N.)
Coats, Sir T.Glen (Renfrew, W)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm'gh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim, S)
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Davies,David (Montgomery Co
Dixon-Hartland,SirFred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan,Robert(Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner,Col.Alan (Hereford, S.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton Marquess of
Hardy Laurence(Kent, Ashf'rd
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edmd's
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)

Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Keswick, William
Kimber, Sir Henry
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareh'm
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh, W
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thompson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Napier, T. B.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Major Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.
Waring, Walter
Whitbread, Howard
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Munro Ferguson and Sir Edward Tennant.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House."—(*Mr. A. J. Balfour.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 118; Noes, 374. (Division List No. 150.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Rt Hn. A. J. (City Lond.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Clark, George Smith (Belfast, N.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingham
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W.)
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meysey-Thomson, E. C.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Muntz, Sir Philip A.
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill. Hon. Robert Torrens
Paulton, James Mellor
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Percy, Earl
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Renton, Major Leslie
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)

Whitbread, Howard
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E. R.)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Viscount Valentia and Mr. Forster.

NOES

Abraham, William (Cork,N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Allen,A.Acland(Christchurch)
Allen, Charles P. (Stroud)
Ambrose, Robert
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton Thomas Gair
Asquith Rt.Hon.HerbertHenry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker,JosephA.(Finsbury,E.)
Baring,Godfrey(Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow,JohnEmmott(Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn,SirJ.Williams(Devonport
Benn,W.(T'w'rHamlets,S.Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell,SirJ.H.(Essex,Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsden, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner,J.F.L.(Lancs.,Leigh)
Brunner,RtHnSirJ.T(Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,SirT.Glen(Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins,SirWm.J.(S.Pancras,W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,C.H.(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, HerbertJ. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Cross, Alexander
Crossley, William J.
Dalziel, James Henry
Davies,David(MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson,W.H.(St.Pancras,N.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Rt. Hon. Sir Walter
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner,Col.Alan(Hereford,S.)
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Gilhooly, James
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Hall, Frederick
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harmsworth,R.L.(Caithn'ss-sh
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Hawood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson J.M.(Aberdeen W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, HughCecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Leese,SirJosephF. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A.Levy(Essex,Harwich
Lever, W.H.(Cheshire,Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkBurghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, D. Thomas J.
MacVeagh,Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh,Charles (Donegal,E.)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield,H.Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James(Roscommon,N.
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Richardson, A.
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Rt.Hn.E. (Dundee)
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson,Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,SirC.E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton underLyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, SirJohn L. (Leeds,S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wodehouse, Lord
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

Bill committed to a Standing Committee.

ADJOURNMENT.

On the Motion for the Adjournment,

MR. WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) gave notice that the Prime Minister would move the suspension of the 11 o'clock Rule to-morrow, in order to obtain the Report stage of the Budget Resolutions.

Adjourned at twenty - four minutes after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Wednesday, 1st *May*, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill.—Read 2ª, and committed.

Birmingham Corporation Water Bill [H.L.].—Read 3ª, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Colne Valley Water Bill [H.L.]; Coventry Corporation Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord Templemore be proposed to the House as a member of the Select Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Marquess of Zetland; read, and agreed to.

Boston Spa Gas Bill; Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill; Swansea Harbour Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1ª, and referred to the Examiners.

Tramway Orders Confirmation Bill [H.L.].—A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Tramways Act, 1870, relating to Audenshaw Urban District Council Tramway, Huddersfield Corporation Tramway, Leeds Corporation Tramways, Taunton Tramways (Extension), and West Ham Corporation Tramways, was presented by the Lord Granard (*E. Granard*); read 1ª; to be printed, and referred to the Examiners. (No. 47).

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London No. 1) Bill [H.L.].—Read 2ª (according to order).

London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market) Bill.—House in Committee (according to order): Bill reported without amendment; Standing Committee negatived; and Bill to be read 3ª To-morrow.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

NAVY (HYDROGRAPHER'S REPORT).

Report on Admiralty Surveys for the year 1906, by the Hydrographer.

BOBBINITE.

Report of the Departmental Committee on Bobbinite; minutes of evidence.

TRADE.

Annual statement of the trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Possessions, 1906, compared with the four preceding years: Volume I. (Summaries, abstract, and detailed tables of imports and exports).

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PENAL SERVITUDE ACTS, 1853–1891 (CONDITIONAL LICENCE).

Licence granted by His Majesty to Rose Smith, a convict under detention in Aylesbury Prison, permitting her to be at large on condition that she enter the Elizabeth Fry Refuge, London, E.: Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

THE NAVY.

EARL CAWDOR rose to call attention to the statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty explanatory of the Navy Estimates, 1907–1908, and to ask—

1. For information as to the present constitution of the Home Fleet, with special reference to the manning and efficiency of the squadrons at the Nore;

2. Whether a statement can be made comparing the state of repairs of the ships of the Fleet in January, 1905 and 1907, similar to that which has been given for 1904 and 1907;

3. Whether the arrangements and staff at the various dockyards are at present sufficient for the efficient repair and maintenance of the Fleets;

4. What is the exact position as to dockyard accommodation for ships of the "Dreadnought" and "Invincible" Class at home and abroad, and what steps are being taken at Rosyth or elsewhere for further provision of such accommodation.

The noble Earl said: My Lords, in bringing before your Lordships' notice the Questions which stand in my name on the Paper I trust the House and the noble Lord opposite will believe that I do so in no contentious spirit and with no view of fault finding, but with the object simply and solely of affording the First Lord an opportunity of giving some information on the matters to which these Questions refer, on which I think it would be very desirable if your Lordships and the public had some further information.

In the first instance, I wish to draw attention to the Home Fleet. The noble Lord, in his Memorandum to which I have called attention, told us in February last that the Home Fleet would be constituted by April of this year. By constituted I do not mean to pin the noble Lord to having the Home Fleet in an absolutely perfect condition. I think we have understood from him, and it has been stated in another place, that the Home Fleet would take some considerable time to consolidate, and therefore I do not expect to be told that that fleet is at present in a perfect condition. But I do ask that we may be told what the exact position is at the present time. With a view of strengthing the Home Fleet, with a view, I think, almost of creating the Nore part of the Home Fleet, your Lordships will remember that six battleships and six first-class cruisers were withdrawn from the Mediterranean, the Atlantic, and the Channel Fleets; and we were told a short time ago that six battleships, six first-class cruisers, a certain number of small cruisers, and forty-eight destroyers were to be concentrated at the Nore with full crews and ready for any emergency at a moment's notice. I would venture to ask the noble Lord what is the exact condition, not alone of the Home Fleet as a whole, but especially with respect to the Fleet at the Nore? I should like to ask whether these six battleships and six first-class cruisers, the forty-eight destroyers, and the second-class cruisers are at the present time fully manned with their proper crews, or whether to any extent they are manned by men who are still undergoing their training.

We are told that in time of war the Home Fleet is to be under the orders of the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet. I should like to know whether, that being so, the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet is to have any control and, if so, what control, over the Home Fleet in time of peace, because it occurs to me there may be some difficulties in the Commander-in-Chief taking up the command of a Fleet and not being very well acquainted with the officers commanding the ships or with the ships themselves, and I should like to know whether the Home Fleet is to be an independent command or a command subordinate to the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet.

There is one other Question I should like to ask under this head arising out of an Answer given a few days ago in another place. The Secretary to the Admiralty was questioned with respect to gun practice and also with respect to the amount of ammunition to be issued to the Home Fleet. He was asked whether the amount of ammunition issued to the Home Fleet would be the same as that issued to the other Fleets in active service, and his reply was, "No." I hope we may tempt the noble Lord to give us a little more detailed information. I should like to know, not alone whether the amount of ammunition issued to the Home Fleet is to be less than that issued to the other Fleets in commission, but more especially on what footing the Fleet at the Nore, which we are told is to be our foremost fighting Fleet, is to be dealt with in reference to the important item of ammunition.

I come next to a statement made by the noble Lord in his Memorandum on the Navy Estimates with respect to vessels unavailable owing to the need for repairs in the years 1904 and 1907. The noble Lord pointed out the greater efficiency that had taken place in respect to repairs and the general condition of the Fleet since the introduction of the nucleus crew system. The nucleus crew system, so far as I am aware, came into active operation in the early part of 1905. During the year 1904, as far as my information goes, there was a very considerable outlay in repairs, in some cases clearly for the purpose of bringing up the vessels that were then in reserve so that they should be fit to be taken charge of by the nucleus crews and worked under the nucleus crew system. Therefore I suggest to the noble Lord that a comparison should be given to your Lordships as between the year 1905, when the nucleus crew system was started, and the year at which we have at present arrived. That would give us a fairer Estimate than the estimate between 1904 and 1907. I do not know what the reason was for selecting the year 1904.

*THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord TWEEDMOUTH): It was selected because it was just before the new plan of nucleus crews came out.

EARL CAWDOR: At all events, we should like to know the comparison between the years I have named. There is one other point with respect to this statement—it is that the numbers of the ships compared in each class are not the same in the two years. For instance, the battleships in 1904 were sixty in number; in 1907 they were fifty-one. Armoured cruisers were twenty-four in number in 1904; they were twenty-eight in 1907. Unarmoured cruisers were eighty-four in number in 1904; they were seventy-six in 1907. The number of destroyers in 1904 was 110 and in 1907, 148.

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH: One hundred and forty-three.

EARL CAWDOR: I beg the noble Lord's pardon—143. Therefore, there was a substantial increase in armoured vessels and destroyers, and a substantial decrease in battleships and unarmoured cruisers in 1907, as compared with the figures given for 1904. It occurs to me that that may to some extent diminish the value of the statement made, and that it would be better if we had a like number of vessels compared in the two years taken for the purpose of comparison. That affects merely the repairs of vessels in order to make them available; but, with respect to repairs generally, we understand that there have been considerable reductions in the staffs at the various dockyards, and I ask the noble Lord if he can tell us whether, looking to these reductions, the Board of Admiralty are now quite satisfied that the staff and the arrangements at all the dockyards, both at home and abroad, are sufficient and efficient for keeping the vessels of the Fleets in a proper and satisfactory state of repair. I ask this question because it is impossible not to know that there are murmurs in some quarters, and statements have been made, that these vessels are not in repair. I have no knowledge on the point myself, but the statements have been made so often and so repeatedly by those who ought to know that I hope the noble Lord will be able to give us a definite statement with regard to that matter.

Then I come to the question of the nucleus crew system, and I do not for a moment wish to put that system on the noble Lord's shoulders more than he has put it upon his own shoulders by adopting it. We are anxious to know how the system is progressing. I should like to know whether the experience of the Admiralty in the last two years has led them to believe that under that system vessels are being properly manned, and are able properly to maintain their speed. I should like to know whether any reports have been received on that subject bearing especially on the nucleus crew system, and, if so, how far they have been satisfactory in their statements in that respect.

I now come to the last Question I have on the Paper, with respect to dockyard accommodation, both at home and abroad, for vessels of the "Dreadnought" and "Invincible" classes. Your Lordships will be well aware that the increased size of these vessels makes the ordinary docks in many instances useless for the purpose of their repair. We have had also put before us very clearly that this Fleet at the Nore is to be in the front rank of our fighting Fleets for the defence of our shores. We are told that its manœuvring and practising ground is to be the North Sea. I should like to know what accommodation there is, not only at home and abroad for all the Fleets so far as vessels of these two classes are concerned, but more especially how it is proposed to deal with these vessels when they are concentrated at the Nore. The question is one of vital importance. We have been told by the noble Lord himself, and the statement has been made in another place, that in a very few years, I think by 1909, we shall have a good many of these vessels in commission; and that, assuming that many of them may be concentrated at the Nore, it is absolutely essential that there should be proper docking accommodation for those vessels within reasonable reach. It does not very much matter how many docks there are, but the important point is whether those docks are, and to what extent they are, really available, and conveniently available, for the various branches of the Fleet, not alone in time of peace, but more important still for those vessels in time of war. I should like to know whether there is any satisfactory accommodation for those vessels in the United Kingdom at the present time, apart from Portsmouth and Devonport. I have been told that the accommodation at Portsmouth was not found to be as satisfactory as had been expected. I do not know how far the noble Lord will be able to contradict that, or to give us any definite details in regard to it. There is satisfactory accommodation to a certain extent for the vessels at Keyham, and, I believe, at Devonport. But, my Lords, imagine the position of a Fleet made up of "Dreadnought" battleships and of the "Invincible" class of first-class cruisers in the North Sea in time of war with no satisfactory base for repairs nearer than Devonport. That is a most serious question, and one which I am sure must have pressed itself very much on my noble friend; and I am perfectly certain that he and the Board of Admiralty, over whom he so ably presides, must have it very strongly in their minds. I would ask the noble Lord, if he could, to tell us what is being done in order to supply that accommodation.

There is, of course, Rosyth. I believe it was stated in another place that Rosyth had had a very chequered career; it has been under consideration for a considerable time. It was first seriously considered in 1900, and I believe the estimated cost of supplying what was thought necessary was then £10,000,000. In August, 1905, an Estimate was prepared showing an outlay of £2,300,000 for Rosyth, but I find that in the Estimates for this year the only Vote taken is a sum of £10,000. Now you cannot build dry docks for "Invincibles" or vessels of the "Dreadnought" type for £10,000. I would press this matter strongly on the noble Lord. It is one of vital importance. It is absolutely important that you should select the proper base, and, having selected it, it is equally important that no time should be lost. Assuming that Rosyth or some other place on that coast is selected, how many years would it take to provide the necessary accommodation? I am told that it would take from eight to nine years, and in three years or two years we may have six or eight of these vessels, many of them quartered in the North Sea, and no place available in time of war for docking or repairing them, unless they pass through the Channel—a dangerous course to take, I imagine, in time of war—in order to get to Portsmouth, and possibly to Devonport. I hope the noble Lord will be able to give us satisfactory information on this point, and as to the provision to be made for the two classes of vessels to which I have referred, so that the country may feel assured that proper steps are being taken to supply the accommodation as quickly as may be. I beg to ask the Questions standing in my name.

LORD BRASSEY: My Lords, Lord Cawdor's observations in reference to repairs affords an opportunity for calling attention to the Returns of casualties to ships, annually presented to Parliament. Commencing with the year 1901, and dealing only with battleships and crusiers, casualties were very few. In 1905 the increase was serious. In all cases blame was attributable. The Return for 1906 has not yet been presented. We have lost a battleship. It is a matter of common knowledge that serious casualties have occurred, especially among battleships. As might have been expected, casualties have always been numerous in the torpedo flotilla. In many cases blame was attributable. The ships of the British Navy are, as a rule, navigated and handled with consummate skill. The recent manœuvres off Lagos Bay, under the direction of Sir Arthur Wilson, were carried out by all concerned in a manner which redounds to the credit of the British Navy. Casualties, however, have, of late, been numerous. They call for a remedy. I venture to submit that the course of instruction for junior officers in pilotage and navigation should be extended, and that more small vessels should be attached to the school for practical exercises, under the direction of experienced officers.

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH: My Lords, perhaps it will be convenient if, before dealing with the Questions asked by Lord Cawdor, I say a word or two upon Lord Brassey's remarks. In the first place, I think the noble Lord a little exaggerated the average groundings which have taken place. It is quite true that 1905 was a very bad year; there were forty-one cases of grounding; but last year there were only twenty-eight groundings. From the year 1887 there has been a gradual decrease in the number of groundings on the whole. They were as high as 47 in 1887, but in no year since, except the one year, have they reached forty. They fell last year to twenty-eight. It is impossible to escape an occasional grounding.

So far as the practice of destroyers is concerned, I think the men in them would not receive a really good training unless they worked in the dark at night, and these conditions of going at high speed on dark nights must necessarily sometimes lead to regrettable incidents. That was very well illustrated the other day in the accident that occurred to the "Ariel" at Malta. There is no doubt whatever that the commander of that boat suffered because he was blinded by the electric searchlight from the harbour. It is only due to the commander of that boat to express great admiration for the way he saved his crew after the accident occurred.

Lord Brassey next found fault with the amount of attention that is paid to navigation instruction. It is true that up to 1903 the instruction in navigation was extremely casual. The young man who went in for navigation was allowed to become a navigator without thorough instruction. Volunteers were taken, and their instruction was most desultory. They were accepted as volunteers without having more training than they could get as midshipmen or at the Naval College at Greenwich on their examination for lieutenancies, and after three years they were allowed to act as navigating officers of small ships and then allowed to qualify as navigating officers of big ships. But that was all changed in 1903. A navigation school was then established on board the "Mercury," under Captain Oliver, and a tribute is due to the work which Captain Oliver has done. Very good instruction is now given to young men who come out as navigating officers. The "Dryad" is now the vessel, with two tenders attached, the "Harrier" and the "Plucky." My noble friend has suggested that the number of these small vessels should be increased. I would like to point out to the noble Lord that the destroyer flotilla is more or less at the disposal of the captain of the "Dryad," and that he does use some of the destroyers for the purpose of instructing officers under his charge.

A great deal more attention is now paid to teaching navigation. Navigating lieutenants and torpedo and gunnery lieutenants are treated in very much the same way; the Admiralty take navigating officers from men who volunteer for that particular work, and a preference is given to those young men who, as sub-lieutenants, qualify for pilotage certificates. Then the selected candidates are sent to the navigation school at Portsmouth—the "Dryad" now—and there they have to go through a course of ninety days. They then act as assistants to navigating officers in large ships, and they must obtain a certificate from the navigating officer of a large ship before they themselves can undertake any such responsibility as the navigating of ships They have this further obligation imposed upon them, that they have to pass the examination for first-class ships after three years service as navigating lieutenants before they can be appointed to navigate big ships.

In making a comparison of the number of groundings and accidents year by year the difference in the vessels now and in past years must be considered. The immense increase in the size, the increased complexity of machinery, and the much higher speeds, all make the risks greater. I think the result is to show that the navigation of our ships is better than it was twenty or twenty-five years ago. The effect of the navigation school at Portsmouth will be more apparent when the men who attend it become navigators in the service. Of course the senior officers in the service never had the training in navigation which modern officers are able to obtain, and, therefore, except by experience, they are not as qualified as I hope the officers of the future will be.

I now come to the Questions on the Paper, and I hope I shall be able to give adequate Answers. It must be remembered that the Home Fleet is still in a state of development. We do not pretend that it is complete or that it will remain as it is now constituted. The Admiralty retain their complete freedom to modify the constitution of this Fleet and particularly the Nore Division; the intention being to maintain this particular part of the Fleet at a strength consistent with the strategical needs of the moment.

The present constitution of the Home Fleet is as follows: There is a division of six battleships—the "Dreadnought," the "Bulwark," the "London," the "Magnificent," the "Majestic," and the "Victorious." The noble Earl said there were several greater ships either launched and now finished, or laid down. Those ships will no doubt take the place of other ships which now are in the Home Fleet. The Cruiser Squadron consists of six first-class armoured cruisers. One of these, the "Warrior," will join the Fleet during the present month. These are all stationed at the Nore. All these twelve ships have full complements. Then we have four flotillas of destroyers of twelve boats each in full commission. They are based at the Nore and Dover or Portland with the necessary parent ships, scouts, and so forth. Further than that, we have at each of the home ports twenty-five destroyers in commission, each of which has four-fifths of its full crew; and they, too, have their proper provision of parent ships and scouts. All the remaining efficient modern battleships and cruisers are in the other two home ports. Portsmouth has four battleships and twelve cruisers. Devonport has three battleships and ten cruisers. They are in commission and they all have, as nucleus crews, three-fifths of their full complement on board.

Then there are a certain number of older vessels which are not so fully manned. They are seven "Royal Sovereigns," two "Niles," two "Centurions," one "Renown," six "Edgars," and five "Latonas." They are not fully manned, but they are maintained in an efficient condition for special service. There is a special crew of about seventy men in each of these ships. I believe that in a certain number of them, which are termed leading ships, the crew either is now or will be kept at 100. These ships have sufficient crews to keep their machinery in thorough order. In this category of ships there are also one battleship and three cruisers which are employed as tenders to the gunnery and torpedo schools. These four ships have a very considerable complement. The men on board are thoroughly efficient in torpedo and gunnery work, because they have to carry out the instruction of both officers and men.

Some exception has been taken to the proportion of younger untrained men on board the ships at the Nore. Your Lordships need have no apprehension that these ships are not sufficiently and well manned. It is true that about one-seventh of the crews are young men who are now going through their training, but there is a full complement of the higher and skilled ratings on board these ships, and the number is quite sufficient to do the daily work. I would remind the House that these ships at the Nore are in a far better condition with regard to manning than the old Channel Fleet, which was the great striking force of the Navy in those days, used to be. The former practice was to change one-fourth of the crews of the Channel Fleet every six months, and therefore the whole of the crews were completely changed every two years. That practice has been stopped, and all the higher ratings, the more important men, are kept permanently on board these ships.

I will give your Lordships an interesting comparison. I have recently received a report relating to the condition of the eight principal German battleships, which are kept in the fullest state of preparation. I am informed that one-third of the crews of these first-class battleships are recruits, one-third are two years service men, and one-third are long service men. I am also told that these German ships go to sea on the average eight days a month, or twenty-five days in the quarter. In the quarter ended

31st March this year, they had 31½ sea days, and on many occasions that they were at sea they passed the night in port. Therefore, I think the ships at the Nore compare favourably with these eight German battleships both in regard to their crews and their sea time.

With regard to the second Question, I can assure the noble Earl that there was no sort of *arrière pensée* in taking the dates 1904 and 1907. I was abroad at the time I was preparing that Statement, and I took 1904 simply because it was the date just before the nucleus crew system was introduced. The percentages the noble Earl asks for are as follows:—Of fifty-eight battleships at the end of January, 1905, nineteen were unavailable owing to need for repairs, or 33 per cent.; and of fifty-one battleships at the end of January, 1907, eight were so unavailable, or 16 per cent. Of twenty-four armoured cruisers at the end of January, 1905, six were unavailable, or 25 per cent.; and of twenty-eight vessels at the end of January, 1907, seven were unavailable, or 25 per cent. Of eighty-four unarmoured vessels at the end of January, 1905, twenty-four were unavailable, or 28½ per cent.; and of seventy-six unarmoured vessels at the end of January, 1907, seventeen were unavailable, or 22½ per cent. Of 128 destroyers at the end of January, 1905, thirty-six were unavailable, or 28 per cent.; and of 143 destroyers at the end of January, 1907, twenty-nine were unavailable, or 19 per cent. The year 1905 is better than the year 1904, but still the year 1907 is considerably better than the year 1905. I now pass to the next Question.

EARL CAWDOR: Before the noble Lord passes away from the Home Fleet there are two other Questions I put to him—one with regard to the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet, and the other as to the ammunition supplied to the Fleet at the Nore.

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH: As to the Commander-in-Chief in time of war, it is perfectly true that the Commander-in-Chief of the Channel Fleet, as senior officer, will take command of the whole Fleet. The arrangement that has been made with regard to destroyers and cruisers is that when the Commander-in-Chief wishes to have them for the purposes of drill or anything of that sort he has to apply to the Admiralty for them, and the destroyers are put at his disposal. The same thing applies to the cruiser squadron at the Nore, which is put at the disposal of the Commander-in-Chief, at the discretion of the Admiralty, when he asks for it, so that he will have considerable opportunities of carrying on manœuvres with the assistance of those additions to the Fleet. With regard to the amount of ammunition issued to the Home Fleet, it is the same as that issued to fleets abroad; the amount of ammunition allowed per annum for exercise to the Home Fleet is thirteen-sixteenths of that allowed to other Fleets, and is composed three-fourths of practice ammunition and the rest of live shell.

EARL CAWDOR: Does that apply to the Fleet at the Nore?

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH: Yes. Coming to the question of the dockyards, as a matter of fact in the whole of the dockyards we employ at this moment, I think, 100 more men than when I took office. We have altogether 27,878 men, and, so far as I am able to judge, that number is sufficient to keep up the repairs, which are being efficiently attended to. I think I may fairly say that the staff in the dockyards is on the whole sufficient and efficient for the work they have to do, both in construction and in repairs. Of course we have from time to time to make special arrangements. For instance we have had two ships in hand lately which required to be quickly dealt with—the "Commonwealth" and the "Dominion"—and we have added a certain number of men to their staff to deal with those ships quickly and satisfactorily.

With regard to the docks available for big ships, I think on the whole we may say that we are in a pretty satisfactory condition, and certainly we are far ahead of the other nations of the world with regard to dock accommodation. At this moment we have thirteen Government dockyards in this country and abroad that will take "Dreadnoughts"—at Portsmouth, one dock;

at Devonport, four; at Gibraltar, two; at Malta, three; at Bermuda, one; at Hong-kong, one; and at Simon's Bay, one. The dock at Halifax would also take a "Dreadnought," but that dock is now out of the Admiralty's hands, the Canadian Government having taken it over. We shall have very shortly a dock that will take a "Dreadnought" and an "Invincible" at Haulbowline. We are lengthening the dock there now. For the "Invincible" class we have more docks—at Chatham, one; at Portsmouth, three; at Devonport, three; at Gibraltar, one; at Malta, two; at Bermuda, one; at Hong-kong, one; at Simon's Bay, one; the docks at Halifax, Colombo, and Sydney will also take "Invincibles," though, of course, none of these three docks are under Admiralty control.

Coming to the question of Rosyth, I believe it is absolutely necessary to have on the East Coast a dock which will take our big ships. I am not prepared to say off-hand what is the best place for it, but we must have one. The present plan which is being considered for Rosyth is a dock and a basin. I think myself that everything points towards Rosyth being the place chosen, but I will not say so for certain. We have, however, already spent a good deal of money on Rosyth, both on experimental works and on the water supply from the local authority. The Board, both under myself and under my predecessors, have made very careful inquiries about Rosyth, and what has now been decided is to draw up complete plans for a dock and a basin, which will in due course be submitted. All these water constructions, however, are exceedingly speculative, and my experience on the Harbour Accommodation Committee whilst I was a Member of the House of Commons has taught me that frequently the money is literally thrown into the sea. So I think we are bound to consider this matter very thoroughly, and to be very certain indeed before we embark upon it that this is the best place from every point of view—from the strategical point of view and from the point of view of convenience for the works.

As to private yards, I only make out that there are five possible docks in private yards which would take a "Dreadnought," and four of these are on the west coast, one at Birkenhead, one at Liverpool, and two at Southampton. As to the other, at Hebburn on the Tyne, I believe it might be possible to squeeze a "Dreadnought" into that, but it is extremely doubtful, and I am inclined to say that if the "Dreadnought" were a crippled ship it would be almost impossible for her to get into that dock at all. So I think I may fairly say that we have not got a dock on the east coast at all which would take a "Dreadnought." We must, therefore, give our best consideration to the particular place for a new dock, and I hope that before next year's Estimates are brought forward, a decision will be arrived at, and that we shall be able to make some more definite announcement.

LORD JOICEY: I should like to ask whether that is the dock which has recently been finished.

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH: It is. I think it has got 26½ feet on the sills, and it is a very nice thing to get the "Dreadnought" into that. I think I have answered the Questions that the noble Earl has addressed to me. I have endeavoured to speak perfectly frankly, and I have not tried to hide anything from the House. I can only say I hope that the policy we have adopted is one which will be for the benefit of the Navy and of the country.

EARL CAWDOR: I should like to thank the noble Lord for his full and courteous answer, but there are two or three points I did not quite understand. I gathered that out of the forty-eight destroyers which we had understood were to be concentrated at the Nore with the rest of the Fleet, twelve are based on Portland. Surely they can hardly be considered part of the Nore Fleet if they are based on Portland?

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH: The twelve ships I spoke of are the Nore Division of the Home Fleet. The destroyers are all in the Home Fleet.

EARL CAWDOR: In his Memorandum, the noble Lord stated that—

> "These twelve ships, together with forty-eight destroyers with full crews, some small cruisers, and the requisite auxiliaries will be concentrated at the Nore."

It is not said that these forty-eight destroyers are scattered throughout the Home Fleet, but that they are to be concentrated with full crews at the Nore. How is it, then, that twelve are to be based on Portland? The noble Lord has given us a comparison between the number of partially-trained men in the Nore Fleet and that in the Channel Fleet of past years; but what I should like to have known was, not how it compared with the Channel Fleet of years ago, but how it compared with the Channel Fleet of to-day, and with the Mediterranean and Atlantic Fleets, because we are told that the Nore Fleet is to be constantly ready for any emergency. There is another point. The noble Lord did not tell us whether the Admiralty were satisfied that the system of nucleus crews had resulted favourably as regards the repairs to the vessels which are maintained by nucleus crews and not in repairing dockyards.

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH: The whole of the forty-eight destroyers are to be based on the Nore; those at present at Portland are available for training with Lord Charles Beresford's Fleet. What we believe is that the repairs are very well kept up in the nucleus crew ships, and that those repairs have been greatly helped by the engine-room artificers on board the ships, the number of whom has been increased.

*LORD ELLENBOROUGH: My Lords, I was very glad to learn from the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty that he requires no arguments to convince him of the necessity of a repairing dock on the east coast; but I am sorry to find that he does not attempt to follow that up by asking in another place for a large Vote of money. He merely asks for £10,000 to ascertain the geology of the neighbourhood of Rosyth, which might easily have been done before. The noble Lord cannot act upon that report unless he gets a Vote passed in another place in time, and therefore any attempt at actual work at Rosyth is put off until April of next year. It takes a great many years to build docks; it is a pity, therefore, to lose time. Portsmouth represents the work of centuries, and yet we have only one dock there big enough to take a "Dreadnought." We have gone rather far in scooping out Portsmouth; we have scooped out so much mud that we have increased the strength of the tide, and these immense vessels are rendered unhandy in consequence. I would suggest that the next time the opinion of experts is taken on dock accommodation at Portsmouth, it should be considered whether the widening of the mouth of the harbour, so as to lessen the currents and tides, should not be undertaken. I note with satisfaction that the Government is going to build another dock at Haulbowline, for by so doing it is greatly strengthening the arguments against any approach to Home Rule. I should, however, have been still more pleased if a dock had been commenced on the East Coast. I was glad to hear that the six battleships, six cruisers, and forty-eight destroyers are in a better state than I thought, but I hope that the proportion of one-seventh of partially trained men in their crews will be eliminated or further reduced in vessels which are put in the front rank. It is rather a small Fleet for the work it will have to undertake, and there is a risk that if one or two of the ships are out of repair, the Fleet may be overpowered before other vessels could come to its assistance. I know the value of giving our Admirals large fleets to manœuvre, but it may be paid for too dearly if the North Sea and the Channel are stripped of vessels for the purpose of manœuvres at a distance from our shores. I therefore suggest the strengthening of the Home Fleet. I had intended saying more in this discussion, but as I find that the First Lord is converted to the necessity of a dock on the east coast I shall not trouble the House further.

*THE EARL OF HARDWICKE: I should like to ask whether the nucleus crews merely look after the engines and other machinery on board ship, or whether they are regularly trained like other crews?

*LORD TWEEDMOUTH: All the nucleus crews in the ships which go to sea are trained. Only the Reserve ships have the smaller nucleus crews, and they remain in harbour, and only their machinery and so forth is kept ready and cleaned.

LORD LEITH OF FYVIE: My Lords, the reductions that have been made in the dockyards since 1904 must have materially diminished the ability to carry out repairs. The reductions for the period 1904–7 represent 22 per cent. of the actual *employés* in the dockyards, and, in considering this question, it would be very useful to know whether those reductions were in the dockyards used for construction or in the dockyards that were to be generally used for repairs in time of war. The dockyards as they are at present are not ready even for our Fleets when they come home from manœuvres. You hear from captains and officers that ships are laid up and repairs are not taken in hand because they cannot be. The policy of nucleus ships and nucleus crews is undoubtedly an admirable one if carried out as it was theoretically intended to be, namely, that you should have in the nucleus crew a large proportion of capable, well-trained men both as gunners and in the engine room. But, unfortunately, the evidence of the ships as they go to sea is that they are not perfectly ready for war, that they are not ready to run full speed at once. Our ships are repaired to a point at which it is well understood they are not ready for war. With the best intentions on the part of the First Lord, I feel that we do not get the information which would enable us to judge whether the Navy is being kept up to date or not. We can only get it from our admirals when they test the Fleets fully up to war manœuvres; but, unfortunately, our admirals must obey orders and are not there to criticise. What we require to have is a system which will give us comparative details as to whether our Navy is being kept up to date, and whether the wonderful new developments of machines are properly taken care of. With regard to strategy, we are now told for the first time that the Lords of the Admiralty are not rigidly bound to the size of the Home Fleet as it was originally outlined, and that they keep themselves free to increase or decrease it as they please. That, undoubtedly, must be the case. I do not see how the Lords of the Admiralty could do otherwise when they have no docking arrangements to fall back upon in the North Sea. The Fleet must pursue the old fighting policy of Nelson of attacking the enemy in their own ports, and cannot act as a Fleet of defence. That may be a reason for the uncertainty and inconsistency in regard to expenditure on docks on the east coast. But if the Government propose to have a dock on the east coast at all, surely £10,000, which they have put on the Estimate, is quite inadequate for the purpose. It shows that no practical sense is being applied to the matter.

STANDING ORDERS OF THE HOUSE.

EARL BEAUCHAMP: My Lords, the noble Marquess who leads the House has asked me to express his regret that an important engagement keeps him elsewhere, and has requested me to move for him the Resolution standing on the Paper. I understand that its terms are approved of by the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition and that the Motion is not opposed. I therefore beg to move.

Moved, "To amend the reference to the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the Standing Orders of the House which relate to order in debate, and to report what alterations, if any, are desirable in those Standing Orders, by adding the following words; 'and to inquire into the practice hitherto followed in the case of Peers who may have sat and voted without taking the oath, and to report what alterations, if any, it would be desirable to make in such practice.'"—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

Moved, That the Lords following be named of the Committee, viz.:—

L. Chancellor.
L. President. (*E. Crewe.*)
L. Privy Seal. (*M. Ripon.*)
D. Devonshire.
D. Rutland.
D. Northumberland.
M. Lansdowne.
E. Onslow.
E. Cawdor.
E. Camperdown.
E. Halsbury.
V. Selby.
L. Balfour.
L. Kenry. (*E. Dunraven.*)
L. Tweedmouth.
L. Newton.
L. Burghclere.

—(*Earl Beauchamp.*)

On Question, Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at a Quarter before Six o'clock, till Tomorrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 1*st May*, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

MR. SPEAKER'S ABSENCE.

The House being met, the Clerk at the Table informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. SPEAKER, owing to indisposition.

Whereupon Mr. EMMOTT, the Chairman of Ways and Means, proceeded to the Table, and, after Prayers, took the Chair as Deputy Speaker, pursuant to the Standing Order.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confer further powers upon the Southend Waterworks Company; to extend their limits for the supply of water; to authorise the transfer to them of the water undertakings of the Urban District Council of Leigh-on-Sea and the Rural District Council of Billericay; to raise additional capital; and for other purposes." [Southend Water Bill [Lords].]

Southend Water Bill [Lords]. Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petition from Chudleigh, against; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT (1901) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, against to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour: From Kames; Partick; and, Stirling; to lie upon the Table.

LONDON MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS (HOURS OF POLL) BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition against: From Little Grandsden; and, Nuneaton; to lie upon the Table.

MUNICIPAL MILK DEPOTS BILL.

Petition from Battersea, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petitions for legislation: From Bedwellty; Pembroke; and, Stepney; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICERS BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRADE (FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND BRITISH POSSESSIONS).

Copy presented, of Annual Statement of the Trade of the United Kingdom with Foreign Countries and British Possessions for 1906. Volume I. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOBBINITE.

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee on Bobbinite; Minutes of Evidence [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 22nd November, 1906; *Mr. Claude Hay*]; to lie upon the Table.

SMALL LANDHOLDERS (SCOTLAND) [SALARIES].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment out of the Consolidated Fund, and out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of any salaries, compensation, and other expenses, that may be incurred in pursuance of any Act of the present Session to encourage the formation of Small Agricultural Holdings in Scotland, and of authorising the payment of an annual grant for the purposes of such Act (King's Recommendation signified), to-morrow.—(*Mr. Whiteley.*)

TREATMENT OF YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS (SCOTLAND).

Return ordered, "showing, for each Summary Criminal Court in Scotland, the number of Children and Young Persons under sixteen who were proceeded against for Crimes and Offences during 1906, and showing what steps were taken to deal with Children and Young Persons in Court separately from adult prisoners, in the following form, viz.—

Court.	Population of area (Census 1901.)	Total number of Children and Young Persons under 16 years proceeded against in Court.			Number of whom previously convicted.			Dealt with as under.																Whether Children or Young Persons under 16 years are dealt with in Court separately from adult prisoners; and by which method this is carried out.
								Imprisoned.		Fined.			Sent to Reformatory School.	Sent to Industrial School.	Whipped.	Admonished.	Caution with or without sureties (under Section 488, Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892, or at Common Law).	Placed under Probation of First Offenders Act, 1887.	Convicted and continued to a definite date for sentence or disposal (Common Law).	Charge dismissed although proved (Section 12 of Youthful Offenders Act, 1901).	Pledges, &c., forfeited.	Charge withdrawn.	Acquitted ("Not proven" or "Not guilty").	
		M.	F.	Total.	M.	F.	Total	10 days and under.	Over 10 days.	Paid before imprisonment.	Partially paid during imprisonment.	Imprisonment in default.												

—(*Mr. Gulland.*)

WEST INDIAN SUGAR TRADE.

Return ordered, "showing (*a*) Production of Cane Sugar in the West India Islands and British Guiana in each of the years 1900–5, so far as this can be stated—

Colony.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
Trinidad - - -						
Jamaica - - -						
&c. &c. - -						
Total - -						

(*b*) Total exports of Cane Sugar of domestic production from the above-mentioned Colonies in each year, distinguishing exports to the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Canada—

Total exports to.	1900.	1901.	1902.	1903.	1904.	1905.
United Kingdom - -						
United States of America						
Canada - - -						
Other Destinations -						
Total - -						

(*c*) Changes in the Customs rates of duty imposed on Sugar in the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Canada, in the same period."—(*Sir Edward Sassoon.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Salary of Chief Medical Officer of the Post Office.

Mr. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will explain why the salary of the chief medical officer of the Post Office has been raised from a maximum of £1,000 per annum, with an allowance of £100 per annum, to a salary of £1,200 per annum, seeing that before the Select Committee on Post Office wages the chief medical officer admitted that he received salaries from two other institutions for medical attendance.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The salary of the chief medical officer has been raised because it was considered that as it formerly stood it did not afford adequate remuneration for the duties of the post. A proposal for this increase was first made to the Treasury in 1903. It was renewed and agreed to in February, 1906. I understand that when the chief medical officer was appointed to his present post he received permission to continue to hold the two appointments referred to, which do not interfere with the performance of his official duties.

Central Telegraph Office Administration.

Mr. BOWERMAN (Deptford): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he has decided that the duties of examining telegraph messages, now performed by overseers and senior telegraphists in the Central Telegraph Office, are to be performed by women; whether he is aware that, before the Select Committee, official witnesses claimed that these duties were of so superior a character as to differentiate the work of the general body of operators from the senior telegraphists; whether he will explain the reason for making alterations affecting the position of the male staff, after the evidence given before a Select Committee of this House, and before the presentation of its Report; and, whether he is aware that such actions cause a feeling of distrust of the administration throughout the service.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) No such proposal would be considered pending the issue of the Report of the Select Committee. I do not see, therefore, how any "feeling of distrust of the administration throughout the service" can have been caused by actions which have not been taken.

Appointments to Home Office Messengerships.

Sir SAMUEL SCOTT (Marylebone, W.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department how many appointments to permanent messengerships have been made since January, 1906; and what was the occupation of the individual men prior to appointment.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Since January, 1906, two such appointments have been made. One of the men appointed had just left the Royal Horse Artillery, after twelve years service, and the other the Royal Engineers, in which he had served between five and six years.

Sinking Fund for Redemption of Irish Land Stock.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any other sinking fund is applicable for the redemption of Irish land stock, except the amounts arising from payment of annuities due for purchase of Irish land; and, if not, whether he will make provision for the application of such additional sums as will raise the quotation of land stock to a parity, with, say, Consols, 2¾ (1905 issue), now quoted 91½, so that the next issue of stock will be at such a price as will not exhaust the small remaining surplus of the development grant.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The sinking fund for redemption of guaranteed 2¾ per cent. stock is derived partly from the purchase annuities (Section 36 (2) of the Irish Land Act, 1903), partly from the Guarantee Fund (Section 36 (6)), and partly from the Vote for the Irish Land Commission (Section 47 (2)). If the object proposed by the hon. Member be to apply to this purpose a portion of the sinking fund moneys which are by law made applicable to the redemption of the National Debt, I fear that such a course would not be practicable.

Irish Intermediate Education.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of schools that obtained grants under the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Acts in each year from 1900 to 1906; also the number of students who presented themselves for the examinations of the Intermediate Education Board and the number who passed in each of these years.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The particulars are as follows:—

Year.	Number of Schools that obtained grants.	Number of students who presented themselves for examination	Number of students who passed.
1900 . .	363	7,608	5,314
1901 . .	362	8,117	5,332
1902 . .	268	8,379	4,938
1903 . .	262	7,909	4,910
1904 . .	275	8,530	5,398
1905 .	288	9,677	6,665
1906	306	10,967	6,906

Mr. KETTLE: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what was the total amount of the school grant paid by the Intermediate Education Board (Ireland) to managers of Irish secondary schools in the years 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906 respectively; and what was the rate of payment for each successful pupil in each of these years.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Total amount of School Grant paid:—

	£	s.	d.
1903	57,482	12	5
1904	59,293	4	8
1905	53,463	7	6
1906	53,310	15	3

Rate of payment of School Grant for each successful pupil:—

	1903.			1904.			1905.			1906.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Pass pupils:												
Preparatory grade	5	16	0	5	9	0	3	16	0	3	3	0
Junior grade	8	14	0	8	3	6	5	14	0	6	6	0
Middle grade	17	8	0	16	7	0	11	8	0	9	9	0
Senior grade	26	2	0	24	10	6	17	2	0	14	3	6
*Honour pupils:												
Junior grade	13	1	0	12	5	3	8	11	0	9	9	0
Middle grade	26	2	0	24	10	6	17	2	0	14	3	6
Senior grade	39	3	0	36	15	9	25	13	0	21	5	3

Mr. KETTLE: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the income derived by the Intermediate Education Board (Ireland) under Section 3 of The Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890, in each year from 1900 to 1906; and also the total income of the Board in each of those years.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*):—

Year.	Income derived under Section 3 of The Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890.			Total Income of Board.		
	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1900	71,400	2	5	104,444	7	7
1901	64,730	16	2	98,173	7	11
1902	56,583	14	10	90,393	7	2
1903	59,430	14	0	93,511	16	2
1904	56,156	3	4	90,003	13	0
1905	50,385	6	10	84,362	8	10
1906	48,255	19	6	83,079	19	6

Irish Land Commission Staff.

Mr. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, when the number of first-class clerks employed in the Land Commission was reduced by the transfer of two to staff posts of a different designation from that of first-class clerk, the offices of these two clerks were abolished; and whether he can state what is the rank of the officers now occupying the positions formerly held by those first-class clerks.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The two first-class clerks referred to in the Question as appointed to staff posts were and are still attached to the Church Property Department, and they discharge, along with other duties, the duties upon which they were previously engaged. The change in their official designation did not involve the transfer of their duties to other clerks.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state, in view of the fact that there are third-class clerks in the Land Commission Offices at present in receipt of a larger salary than the initial salary of a second-class clerk, while rising to the same maximum salary as the second-class and by the same annual increment, under what circumstances are promotions made from third-class to second-class clerkships in this Department; and whether one of the second-class clerks in the Land Commission is in receipt of a salary which is greater than the maximum salary of a first-class clerk in that Department.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The line of demarcation between the second and third-class clerks has been removed in the interests of the third-class, and, subject to certain limitations prescribed by the Treasury, the members of the third-class may by increment reach the maximum salary of the second-class. Promotions from the third-class are made by the Land Commissioners, who pay regard to efficiency and seniority. Special pay has been assigned from time to time to second-class clerks by reason of the character and importance of the duties discharged by them. The amount of the duty pay so assigned varies. In one instance a second-class clerk, who was called to the Bar in 1898, and had long and special training in the Examiners' Department, was placed in charge of the Vesting Department under the Estates Commissioners and was awarded duty pay which, with his salary, brought his annual emoluments above the maximum salary of a first-class clerk. This officer, though classified as a second-class clerk, does not discharge duties properly assignable to such a clerk.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the number of 121 clerks assigned by the Treasury to the Land Commission in January, 1892, when this Department was organised on a permanent basis, has since that time been increased to 372, principally by the addition of junior Second Division clerks and abstractors; whether he will consider the advisability, in the interests of the public service, of the Treasury instituting an inquiry into the working of this Department with the object of amalgamating, as far as possible, the various classes of clerks in these offices, and arranging the clerical staff on a properly graduated scale such as is adopted in the other Government Departments.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) As regards the first part of the Question, I would refer the hon. Member to my Answer to his former Question of 19th March, in which full details are given.† The duties discharged by the staff of the Land Commission are extremely varied. Many of the posts require professional qualifications and training for their proper discharge, while others are purely clerical; and many of the latter posts can be well filled by junior clerks, boy clerks, and abstractors. It would not be possible to amalgamate the various classes of clerks in the manner suggested. I am not aware of any reason for suggesting to the Treasury that an inquiry in the matter should be held.

Mr. FIELD: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what was the necessity for the appointment of eight legal clerks to the Land Commission at salaries of £350 and £200 per annum; what is the legal nature of their duties; by whom were these duties performed before the creation of these appointments; and are similar duties being satisfactorily performed at present by other officials not enjoying the salary or the title of legal clerks.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi, 639.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The employment of the eight clerks referred to, five of whom are designated conveyancing clerks and three legal clerks, was rendered necessary by the great increase of the business in the Examiners' and Vesting Departments of the Land Commission arising under the Act of 1903. The duties include the vouching of titles, the vesting and conveyancing of holdings, and other work requiring legal training. A considerable portion of the work assigned to these officers was formerly discharged by assistant examiners, who are not now employed, and the duties are not similar in character to those assigned to ordinary clerks at a lower salary. These appointments are temporary, and seven of the holders are barristers or solicitors.

Prohibition of Meeting of the United Irish League, Clooney Branch.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state why the meeting of the Clooney branch of the United Irish League, county Clare, was prohibited on 21st April.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) It was proposed to hold the meeting on a grazing farm, the occupier of which has been subjected to intimidation. The police warned the promoters that the meeting would not be permitted on the farm or in its vicinity, and it was then decided to hold the meeting at Spancil Hill, about two miles away. The meeting at the latter place was not interfered with.

Payment of Kerry Union Medical Officers.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the salaries paid to medical doctors in each of the six unions in Kerry in 1897, the amount credited to each union in the Agricultural Grant in respect of those salaries, the salaries paid in each union in the year 1906, the amount contributed from the Local Taxation Account towards those salaries, the total amount contributed in each union from the Agricultural Grant and the Local Taxation Account towards medical doctors' salaries in each union, and the balance in each union which has to be borne by the rates.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The salaries paid to medical officers in the unions of the county Kerry for the years ended March, 1897, and March, 1906, are as follows—

	Year 1897. £	Year 1906. £
Caherciveen - - -	440	514
Dingle - - -	540	552
Kenmare - - -	440	440
Killarney - - -	703	730
Listowel - - -	600	722
Tralee - - -	755	785

One-half of the amounts in the first column was recouped from the Parliamentary Grant. Of the sums of £730 and £785 given in the second column, one-half was in each case recouped from the Local Taxation Account, and in the remaining cases the amount recouped was a little less than one-half, owing to the limitation imposed by Section 6 (1) of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1902. In the year ended March, 1906, the following additional payments were made for remuneration of substitutes for medical officers who were absent on vacation, and recoupment of one-half of these amounts was allowed under Section 5 (1) of the Act of 1902—

	£	s.	d.
Caherciveen - -	42	0	0
Dingle - - -	8	8	0
Kenmare - -	50	8	0
Killarney - -	29	0	0
Listowel - - -	134	8	0
Tralee - - -	100	16	0

The balance remaining in all the cases referred to above was defrayed out of the rates. It may be added that no portion of the Agricultural Grant is directly payable to relieve any specific union charge, but is applied in aid of the rates on agricultural land generally.

Suggested Appointment of an Irish Travelling Veterinary Inspector.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is intended to appoint a travelling veterinary inspector for Ireland; and, if so, whether the Department of Agriculture intends that the appointment shall be made by examination or by nomination.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I beg to refer to the Answer which I gave to the similar Question of the hon. Member for Waterford on 17th April.† The ordinary transit inspection staff is to be increased by one inspector. The appointment is to be made by nomination from among the existing staff of veterinary inspectors, and is subject to a qualifying examination by the Civil Service Commissioners.

Disturbance at Residence of Mr. William Tomb, County Kerry.

MR. GORDON (Londonderry, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the 25th of March last the dwelling house of Mr. William Tomb, of Upperlands, county Derry, was wrecked by men returning from a meeting of the Ancient Order of Hibernians; whether any persons have been made amenable to justice for this act; and, if not, will he direct that steps be taken to have the perpetrators proceeded against for this offence.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) A prosecution has been instituted against seven persons in connection with this matter. The case is *sub judice.*

Salaries of Irish National School Teachers.

MR. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that principal teachers in Irish national schools appointed for the first time since 1st April, 1900, and to schools with an average attendance of less than seventy, are paid a lower annual salary, by £9 in the case of men and by £7 10s. in the case of lady teachers, than they would receive after having given the same length of service as first assistants; and what steps he proposes to take in this matter.

MR. HUGH LAW: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, under the present rules, a newly appointed principal teacher must give fifteen years efficient service as principal before his salary becomes equal to that which he would have received as a first assistant of only nine years service; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

MR. HUGH LAW: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that in the case of an assistant teacher of five years service on becoming a principal the salary is fixed at £9 per annum more than if he had given the same term of service as a principal teacher; and what steps he proposes to take in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that, as a rule, principal teachers appointed for the first time since 1900, who had not served before that year as assistant teachers, rank in the third grade on appointment, and are paid at the rate of that grade. Assistant teachers are as a rule paid at the rate laid down for third grade teachers, but under the provisions of the fourth Schedule to The Irish Education Act, 1892, certain assistant teachers of five years standing are eligible for a bonus from the school grant of £9 per annum in the case of men, and £7 10s. per annum in the case of women. No similar bonus is provided for principals under the Schedule to the Act. Third grade principal teachers in schools with an average of thirty pupils are, however, eligible for promotion to the second grade with the corresponding emolument, and in schools with an average of fifty but under seventy to the second division of first grade, with the emoluments of that grade. On the other hand assistant teachers, no matter what the size of the school may be, or the length of their service, are generally not eligible for promotion beyond the third grade. Principal teachers appointed since 1900, who had previously served as assistant teachers, receive as a rule initial incomes as principals equal to their former incomes as assistants and in some cases higher incomes. A principal teacher appointed since 1900, with no previous service as assistant, would, in ordinary course of advancement, have a salary of £97 per annum after fifteen years service in addition to the residual capitation grant of about £7 10s. if serving in a small school of thirty pupils. An assistant master after nine years service would have only £86 per annum, including bonus under the Irish Education Act of 1892, with or without residual grant, as the average attendance might warrant. As I have already stated in the House, I should be glad to see some improvement in the position of the teachers generally, and I will continue to give the matter every consideration.

---

† See (4) *Debates,* clxxii., 1000.

Imports of Cattle and Fresh Meat from Argentina and United States.

SIR WILLIAM BULL (Hammersmith): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he will state the number of cattle intended for slaughter from the United States of America and the respective amounts of fresh beef from the United States and Argentina imported into England in 1906; and what proportion of the total amount of the beef consumed in England does this amount represent.

(*Sir Edward Strachey.*) The number of cattle imported from the United States into the United Kingdom in 1906 was 398,887, representing approximately 2,650,000 cwts, of beef. The total imports of fresh beef in 1906 from the United States were 2,426,644 cwts., and from Argentina 2,795,913. It is not possible to calculate the consumption of meat in England separately, but, adopting the estimates made by a Committee of the Royal Statistical Society and accepted by the Royal Commission on the Supply of Food and Raw Material in Time of War, the total consumption of beef in the United Kingdom in 1906 was approximately 1,100,000 tons. Of this total the supply from the United States and Argentina would amount to 36 per cent.

Assistant Clerks (New Class) in the Statistical Department of His Majesty's Customs.

MR. SEAVERNS (Lambeth, Brixton): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury how many men of the new class of assistant clerks are now employed in the Statistical Department of His Majesty's Customs; how many are eligible by service for promotion to Second Division clerkships; how many promotions have been made in the Statistical Office during the past two years and the past twelve months respectively; and will he state if promotions in this office are less frequent than in other departments.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) 127 of the assistant clerks (new class) are employed in the Statistical Office, of whom sixty-three have sufficient service to render them eligible for promotion. There have not been any promotions of assistant clerks (new class) in the Statistical Office to Second Division or port clerkships. The promotions in different departments depend upon the circumstances of the respective departments.

Value of Foreign Manufactured Articles for Government Departments.

MR. T. R. BETHELL (Essex, Maldon): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what was the value of manufactured articles obtained from abroad for the several Government Departments for each year from 1893 to 1906, inclusive.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I have no information to enable me to answer this Question other than that contained in the Return annually moved for by the hon. Member for Central Sheffield.

Naval Pensions—Case of Joseph Mullen.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to the case of Joseph Mullen, No. 197,680, lately serving as an able seaman on H.M.S. "Diamond," who was invalided from the Royal Navy on 19th October, 1905, and given a pension for eighteen months at the rate of £9 18s. a year; whether he is aware that this man is now dying of consumption in Longford; and will he direct that such additional pension will be granted to him as will maintain him for the short period of life yet before him.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Mullen was not invalided for consumption, but for another disease not attributable to the service. He was awarded a temporary pension for eighteen months, which is the full amount allowable from naval funds in his case. His service has been too short to render him eligible for anything but a small temporary pension from the funds of Greenwich Hospital, and he is only eligible for that if he is suffering from the same disability as that for which he was invalided. Mullen will be medically examined and his case will be then considered.

Richmond Park—Repair of Road from Richmond Hill to Kingston Gates.

MR. CAVE (Surrey, Kingston): To ask the First Commissioner of Works when the improvement of the road through Richmond Park from Richmond Hill Gate to Kingston Gate was commenced; and when the work will be completed and the road be again opened for public use.

(*Answered by Mr. Harcourt.*) The work was commenced on 21st February, and the road will be opened at the end of next week, probably the 11th May.

Ecclesiastical Incomes and Income-Tax.

CAPTAIN BALFOUR (Middlesex, Hornsey): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether incumbents of the Church of England, whose income is under £2,000 per annum, and is paid by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners from dividends arising out of stock held in trust for the benefice, can claim the abatement of 3d. in the pound on earned incomes; and whether they can claim the same abatement under Schedule A.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The Answer to the hon. and gallant Member's Question, if my proposals are accepted by Parliament, is in the affirmative.

Government Officials as Representing the Zemindars of Sind on the Bombay Council.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, when the zemindars of Sind were allowed to send one elected member to the Bombay Council, it was provided that no Government official should be allowed to stand as their candidate; whether he is aware that some officials are candidates this year; and whether he will call the attention of the Bombay Government to this breach of the regulations.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Answer to the first part is, so far as I am aware, in the negative. No such provision is contained in the regulations framed under the Indian Councils Act of 1892. This being so, I have no reason to think that any breach of the regulations has been committed in this respect.

Report of the Benares and Behar Opium Agents.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.): To ask the Secretary of State for India if he will place in the Library of the House a copy of the Reports of the Benares and Behar opium agents for the last year available, and of the orders of the Board of Revenue and of the Government thereon.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Reports of the opium agents are incorporated in the Board of Revenue's Report and are not separately published. The Board's Report is no longer reviewed by the Bengal Government. I will see that a copy of the Board's Report for 1905–6 is placed in the Library of the House.

Soldiers and Enforcement of Support of their Families.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that Thomas Sonden, at present serving in Aldershot, who was stationed at Templemore in December, 1887, deserted his child, now living with her grandmother, in a destitute condition in Longford; whether there exist any Army regulations to compel men like Sonden to contribute to the support of their children; and, if so, will steps be taken in this case.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) A General Officer Commanding-in-Chief has power, under the Army Act, to enforce stoppages from the pay of a serving soldier for his child's support. The hon. Member should refer the case to the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Aldershot, giving full particulars, including the man's regiment and regimental number.

Salaries of Surveyors for Engineer Services.

MR. CAVE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the question of the salaries of the surveyors and assistant-surveyors of the staff for engineer services has now been fully considered, and with what result, or when a decision on the subject may be expected.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The question is still under consideration, and it is not practicable at present to say when a decision may be expected.

Unrest in Egypt.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the Prime Minister, whether, in the opinion of his advisers, there is any connection between the unrest in Egypt and that in Lahore, in the latter place the unrest having been caused by travelling political agitators.

(*Answered by Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*) The Answer is in the negative.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

H.M.S. "Antrim."

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if the high-tensile steel bottom plates of H.M.S. "Antrim" and any other ships which have been affected with extensive pittings and oxidation were of British manufacture; and whether the plates were subjected to the usual Admiralty test.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): All the high-tensile steel bottom plates of the "Antrim," and of all other ships in the Navy, have been of British manufacture, and were subjected to the usual Admiralty tests.

MR. HUNT: Has the attention of the right hon. Gentleman been called to the fact that on 1st January, 1906, the Government contractors for Keyham Harbour wrote that under the present changed conditions, Government contractors could buy anchors, machinery, and a hundred and one other things made of foreign material from foreign firms?

*MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Notice should be given of that Question.

MR. HUNT: May I ask if anything except stone can now be provided by Government contractors for anything to do with the British Navy?

*MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): Under what Government was the contract for this ship made?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Under the late Government I believe.

H.M.S. "Argyll."

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty with reference to the extensive pitting and oxidation of the bottom plates of the new armoured cruiser, H.M.S. "Antrim," whether any reports as to signs of oxidation and pitting were received at or prior to the time the ship was taken over from the contractors in 1905; and whether he can state if H.M.S. "Argyll" and any other ships are similarly affected.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The "Antrim" was dry docked immediately prior to acceptance from contractors, and at that time no oxidation or pitting existed in the bottom plating for the vessel. A certain amount of pitting and oxidation has been found in the bottom plating of the "Argyll" and other vessels, but to a much less extent than in the case of the "Antrim."

The Coastguard.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N. W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty how many coastguard men are affected by the closing during the last twelve months of twenty-four stations and seventeen detachments.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: One hundred and sixty men.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: Are these men still in the coastguard service?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Yes, they are employed to fill vacancies.

Coastguard Inquiry.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty who are the gentlemen forming the inter-departmental Committee which is considering the present position of the coastguard stations; what is the reference to the Committee; and when their Report may be expected.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Conference was composed of officials representating the Admiralty, the Irish and Scottish Offices, the Board of Customs and the Board of Trade. There was no formal reference, but the subjects for discussion were outlined in an Admiralty letter laid before the Conference. The Report has been received, but has not yet been considered. When it has been considered, further information will be given.

Dockyard Staff.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state the number of men now employed at each of the following places: Pembroke Dock, Portsmouth, Devonport, and Chatham, compared with the same date in 1905; and whether the staff at Devonport is sufficiently large to deal with the present naval requirements.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The numbers are as follows:—

	1905 (22nd April).	1907 (20th April).
Portsmouth -	10,132	8,698
Devonport - -	8,926	7,901
Chatham - -	8,838	6,829
Pembroke Dock -	2,735	1,972

The reductions since 1905 were practically completed before the present Board came into office. If the hon. Member's Question was suggested by an article which appeared in the Press on Monday, I desire to take this opportunity of stating emphatically that there is absolutely no foundation for the report that Devonport Dockyard cannot cope with the work required of it; and I may add that the Admiral Superintendent wholly repudiates the statements attributed to him.

Sandhurst College Cadets.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS (London University): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, having regard to the fact that about 100 gentlemen cadets were passed out from the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, last December for commissions in the infantry, none of whom have as yet been gazetted, that their military education is meanwhile at a standstill, and their unemployment for upwards of four months is causing inconvenience to their parents and guardians, he is prepared to make a statement as to when they are likely to be appointed to their regiments.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): It is hoped that the whole of the batch of cadets mentioned will, with the exception of those who prefer to wait for vacancies in special regiments, be gazetted on Friday or Tuesday next.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this delay in gazetting young officers from Sandhurst has occurred very frequently of the last few years, and in view of the shortage of junior officers which it is generally agreed exists, will he take steps to get them gazetted earlier?

MR. HALDANE: There is no intentional delay, but there are not always vacancies.

Bulford Camp—The Scots Greys.

CAPTAIN FABER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether sufficient accommodation exists at Bulford camp for the married establishment of the Scots Greys regiment; and, if not, where the married establishment will be quartered.

MR. HALDANE: Sufficient hut accommodation at Bulford for the whole of the married establishment of the Scots Greys exists, but is not at present all available for them. Part of the families will be temporarily accommodated in the new married quarters at Tidworth and will be gradually moved into Bulford according as the work, now in hand, of altering the huts is completed. While at Tidworth the families will receive separation allowance.

Woolwich Arsenal.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many more men will be dismissed from Woolwich during the present financial year.

MR. HALDANE: This Question was put to me only two days ago, and I then explained very fully why it is not possible for me at present to give a definite Answer.†

MR. CLAUDE HAY: When may the House expect an Answer?

MR. HALDANE: As soon as we can settle the very complicated questions involved.

Labour Recruiting in British Central Africa.

MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any proposal has been made by the Transvaal Government for the removal of the embargo on recruiting in British Central Africa: and whether, in fact, any such embargo at present exists.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): As I informed my hon. friend, in reply to the Question which he asked on the 10th of April, the recruiting season in the British Central Africa Protectorate for the Transvaal mines commences on the 1st of July; recruitment, however, cannot begin without the consent of the Secretary of State, and that consent has not as yet been given; in that sense an embargo exists; no proposal for its removal has been made by the Transvaal Government.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Is it the intention to put an embargo on?

MR. CHURCHILL: One at present exists.

Asiatics in British Columbia.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia reserved the Royal Assent last week to an Immigration Bill designed to keep Asiatics out of that Colony; and, if so, whether the Colonial Office has confirmed the Lieutenant-Governor's action in this behalf, or whether the Royal Assent has been accorded.

MR. CHURCHILL: I have no information on the subject of the Bill referred to, but I may remind the hon. Member that the decision in the case of Acts of the Provincial Legislatures rests not with the Secretary of State but with the Governor-General acting on the advice of his Ministers.

Newfoundland.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when it is probable that Papers dealing with Newfoundland will be laid.

MR. CHURCHILL: I can only refer the hon. Member to the reply which I gave on the 18th February to the hon. Member for Mid Armagh‡ and to add that the appeal mentioned in that reply is still undecided.

Nairobi Incident.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Kingston Division of Surrey, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is now prepared to lay upon the Table the Papers relating to the Nairobi incident; and, if not, when Papers will be laid upon the Table.

MR. CHURCHILL: I regret that I cannot fix a date at present. The report of the trial only reached the Colonial Office yesterday.

Emigration to Canada.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that, in a circular issued by the Emigrants' Information Office, intending emigrants to Canada are informed that if they travel to Canada as steerage passengers they will be required, on arrival, either to produce a vaccination certificate or to submit to vaccination or to compulsory detention for observation in a quarantine station, while if they travel otherwise than by steerage no such requirements will be made; and whether this is a correct statement of the Canadian regulations on the subject.

---

† See Cols. 525–7.

‡ See (4) *Debates*, clxix., 540.

MR. CHURCHILL: The statement in question is substantially correct, though the words "Passengers other than steerage are not examined" might be qualified by adding the words "as a rule."

Turkish Customs.

MR. REES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British Ambassador to the Porte has signed the protocol by which the Powers agree to the increase of the Turkish customs duties from 8 to 11 per cent. for a period of seven years; whether he proposes to lay such Papers, if any, as may properly be made public; and, if so, when such Papers will be forthcoming.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury; for Sir EDWARD GREY): The Answer to the first two parts of the Question is in the affirmative. Papers are in course of preparation, and will be laid at the earliest possible date.

Great Britain and Russia, and Persia.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any agreement has been arrived at between His Majesty's Government and that of Russia in relation to Persia.

MR. RUNCIMAN: Nothing can be added at present to the Answer given to the hon. Member for Mid Armagh on the 25th of April last, to the effect that my right hon. friend is not in a position to make any statement as to the nature of any negotiations respecting Persia.

Russo-Japanese War—British Shipowners' Claims.

MR. CLAUDE HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is now in a position to make any statement as to the present state of negotiations with the Russian Government in reference to the matter of compensation to the owners of British ships sunk by Russian ships of war during the Russo-Japanese War.

MR. RUNCIMAN: My right hon, friend regrets that he is not in a position to make any further statement at present. The case of the "Knight Commander" is still the subject of negotiations between the two Governments. The other cases are expected shortly to come before the Prize Court at Libau.

Sugar Duties and the Fruit-Growing Industry.

MR. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in declining to remit the sugar duties or any portion thereof, he has considered the effect of the tax on the fruit-growing industry, which the Departmental Committee that reported two years ago stated to be the only form of agriculture that has exhibited any sign of progress in recent years; and whether he is aware that the welfare of fruit growers is entirely bound up with the jam trade, for which sugar at the lowest possible price is an article of first necessity.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): Yes, and I am afraid that the industry to which my hon. friend refers is by no means the only one which is seriously handicapped by these duties, to the objectionable characteristics of which I have always been alive. I regret the fact that the state of the public finances makes it impossible at the present time to dispense with them.

Vivisection Commission Report.

SIR PHILIP MAGNUS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state when the Royal Commission on Experiments on Living Animals for the purposes of Research is likely to report.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The inquiry is not sufficiently advanced to enable an Answer to be given to this Question.

Female Factory Workers in Belfast.

MR. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the number of females employed as textile workers in Belfast in 1891 was 26,617, of whom 8,222 were under twenty years of age; that these numbers have been augmented since 1891; that the total number of females engaged in mills, factories, and warehouses is 50,000 at the present time; and, if so, whether he will consider the advisability of appointing a resident lady inspector, in order that the health and comfort of these workers should receive constant and adequate attention.

MR. GLADSTONE: I have not been able to verify the figures for 1891 which are given in the Question, but the number of females employed in textile factories in Belfast in 1904 (which is the latest year for which figures are available) is roughly computed at a little over 23,000, and the number employed in all factories at between thirty and forty thousand. As I have already stated, an additional lady inspector was recently appointed for residence during two-thirds of the year in Ireland. This inspector resides in Belfast and gives special attention to the work of that district. Under this arrangement Belfast receives a full share of the services of the Lady Inspectors' Branch.

Registered Packet Regulations.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether he will take into consideration the expediency of abolishing the requirement that ordinary packets presented for postal registration shall be sealed with wax, seeing that the official envelopes for registration are exempted from the requirement.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The hon. Member is under a misapprehension in thinking that only packets sealed with wax are accepted for registration. The rule is that before a packet can be accepted for registration it must be fastened with wax, gum or other adhesive matter. It cannot be accepted if merely tied with string.

Illegal Trawling in Dunnet Bay, Caithness.

MR. R. L. HARMSWORTH (Caithness-shire): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he can state when a Fishery Board cruiser last patrolled Dunnet Bay, Caithness; and if he can see his way to give instructions that one of these cruisers patrols these seas with greater constancy than at present to prevent the illegal trawling.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): No complaints of illegal trawling have been received from Dunnet Bay for some time, and consequently no special visit has been ordered. The fishery cruisers periodically visit the north coast, and care will be taken that the part of the coast referred to by my hon. friend will not be neglected.

Irish Land Purchase—Fair Rents.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, seeing that rents are now being fixed generally with a view to subsequent sale and purchase by the same parties, will he ask the Irish Land Commission to require in all future fair-rent cases the capital value of the respective interests of landlords and of tenants and the gross capital value to be stated on the pink schedule, Form No. 39; and, if there is any objection to this, will he ascertain and state what it is.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Land Commission hold that they have no power to do that which is suggested in the Question. The first section of the Land Law Act of 1896 and the form of schedule prescribed in accordance therewith show what the law requires to be recorded. There is no provision that the capital value of the respective interests of landlords and tenants should be recorded.

Killna Castle Estate, Westmeath.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have asked Sir Montague Chapman, Bart., of Killna Castle, Westmeath, to sell his evicted and untenanted lands to them; if so, with what result; and, now that the property belongs to a new owner, will they communicate on this subject with the present agent, Mr. Mason, solicitor, Mullingar.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners communicated with Sir Montague Chapman in July, 1906, upon the subject of his untenanted land, but received no reply. The Commissioners are not aware that the property has since changed hands, but acting on the suggestion in the Question, they have now communicated with the solicitor referred to.

Estates Commissioners' Annual Reports.

MR. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can now state when the next Annual Report of the Estates Commissioners will be issued; will a dissentient Commissioner be allowed to insert in it, as in the last Report, paragraphs impugning the opinion of his colleagues; and what law or precedent is there for this practice.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the statistics for their Report for the year ending 31st March are in course of preparation, but they cannot yet state when the Report will be ready. I have no reason for assuming that there will be any difference of opinion among the Commissioners as to the terms of their Report, but in such a case it is obviously the right of any Commissioner to express his views on any subject in which he may not be in agreement with his colleagues.

Sligo Lunatic Asylum—Evicted Tenants as Pauper Lunatics.

MR. P. A. MCHUGH (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a communication from the joint committee of management of the Sligo District Asylum for the Insane informing him that two evicted tenants, Catherine Mullen, of Knockadoo, and Catherine McDonagh, of Carhownagh, are now detained and supported in that institution as pauper lunatics; whether the farms from which these women were evicted are derelict; and whether the Estates Commissioners would be entitled and prepared to intervene, with the object of having the evicted farms handed over in trust to the representatives of the evicted tenants, so that these women may no longer be a charge upon the rates and may not lose their rights under the provisions of the Land Act of 1903 in regard to evicted tenants.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received the resolution referred to, and a copy has also been sent to me. The Commissioners are of opinion that the suggestion contained in the Question is impracticable.

Mr. G. B. Low's Grenagh Estate.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid. Cork, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that about three years ago the estate of George Bond Low, in the Encumbered Estates Court, and situate in the parish of Grenagh, county Cork, was offered for sale to the tenants; did they agree to purchase, and, if so, on what terms; is he aware that an inspector of the Land Commission was sent to value their holdings at the request of Mr. Justice Ross and recommended sales at prices varying from twelve and a half to nineteen and four-fifth years' purchase; is he aware that this valuation was not accepted by Mr. Justice Ross, and the Land Commission Inspector's report was referred to three Commmissioners for their opinions; will he state the names of these Commissioners; whether they visited the tenants' holdings, and, if not, on what basis they made the calculations they subsequently submitted; will he state what the recommendations of these Commissioners were and whether they were accepted by the court; did the majority of the tenants accept the court terms, and are there four, viz., Patrick Murphy, Denis Callaghan, Denis Donovan, and Thomas Donovan, who refused them on the ground that they were in excess of the value of the land; is he aware that the demand made upon Denis Donovan by the court is seven years purchase in excess of the valuation put upon him by the Land Commission Inspector; that these men, who refused to purchase, have since been writted and harassed and intimidatory methods employed to compel them to purchase on terms which they declare would mean ruin to them; and will the Estates Commissioners, in the exercise of their discretion under the Land Act of 1903, declare that this is an estate on which intimidatory methods and undue pressure have been used against the tenants mentioned, and refuse to sanction the advance of the purchase money until a satisfactory arrangement of this difference between the court and the tenants who have not yet purchased is come to.

MR. BIRRELL: I do not think it is possible within the limits of an Answer to enter into the numerous details of the hon. Member's Question. I have received reports from the Land Judge and the Land Commission from which it appears that the action taken in the case by these authorites was taken in the exercise of the discretion judicially vested in them. I may, however, state that twelve of the tenants concerned have purchased their holdings and that the remaining six, including those named in the Question, have declined to accept the terms offered to them. The Land Judge informs me that it is not the fact that the tenants who refused to purchase have been harassed and intimidated with the object of compelling them to purchase. These tenants not only declined to purchase, but have refused to pay any rent since 1905 when the terms of purchase were offered to them. In this state of things the Land Judge found it necessary to direct that they should be sued for rent, but ordered on 1st March that the proceedings should be stayed if the tenants should pay half a year's rent at present. As regards the concluding part of the Question I am informed that the matter is not one in which the Estates Commissioners could interfere, having regard to the fact that proceedings are pending under the 40th Section of the Land Act of 1896.

Elphin Demonstration.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Sunday, 14th April, a mob of about 2,500 persons, many of them armed, assembled at Elphin, with five bands and demonstrated round the grazing farms; whether he is aware that the object of this demonstration was to intimidate the occupiers of the farms; whether he will state how many police were present on this occasion; and whether they took or intend to take any action in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: On the occasion in question about 2,500 people with five bands assembled at Elphin and proceeded to Shankill, about one and a-half miles distant, where a meeting was held and speeches delivered against the eleven months grazing system. There was nothing to show that any members of the crowd were armed. There are many grazing farms in the district, but the crowd did not demonstrate round them. Twelve policemen were present at the meeting, and an extra force of nearly sixty men were held in reserve in case their services might be required. The police reported that the speeches were not violent, and that no particular persons were denounced. No necessity arose for the interference of the police, and it is not intended to take any action in the matter.

MR. LONSDALE: Was not the object of this demonstration to intimidate certain people?

MR. BIRRELL: I can say nothing more than that the police have reported that no intimidatory language was used. The speeches delivered were against the eleven months grazing system.

MR. LONSDALE: Does the right hon. Gentleman assert that the sole object of the Question is to misrepresent and malign Ireland in the eyes of the English people?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the Question.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Will you not suggest to the hon. Member he should express his regret for making unfounded charges?

[No Answer was returned.]

Intimidatory Processions in Roscommon.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that intimidatory processions are being regularly organised in the county of Roscommon against the farmers who decline to surrender their lands at the bidding of the United Irish League; and whether he will state what orders the police have received as to dealing with these assemblies.

MR. BIRRELL: I am aware that processions and demonstrations in connection with the grazing system have taken place in county Roscommon. As I have already stated, the police will afford full protection to all persons in the exercise of their legal rights, and will take all necessary steps to bring offenders to justice. It would, however, obviously be undesirable to publish details of any instructions issued to the police for the prevention or detection of any particular class of offence.

Ballintubber Demonstration.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that hostile demonstrations have recently been held at the farm of a Protestant named Payne at Ballintubber; whether the police identified a number of the persons taking part in these proceedings; and whether it is intended to take action against the disturbers of the peace.

MR. BIRRELL: On 8th April about 100 persons assembled on Mr. Payne's farm and held a meeting there. On 21st April a meeting was held on the public road over a quarter of a mile from the farm, but no attempt was made to go upon the farm. On this occasion an extra force of forty police was present with the object of preventing any incursion upon the farm. The Government have been advised that the evidence of unlawful acts in connection with the first-named occurrence is not sufficient to warrant proceedings. The police have been instructed to afford full protection to the person and property of Mr. Payne.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether on this occasion intimidatory language was used against Mr. Payne?

MR. BIRRELL: I have no knowledge.

MR. MOORE: Is it not the duty of the right hon. Gentleman to have knowledge?

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Mr. Payne lives several miles from the place where this meeting was held; that nobody resides on the farm, and that there was not a single head of cattle on it at the time?

MR. BIRRELL: I did not know even that.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say if any carrion crows were present on the occasion?

MR. LONSDALE: I desire to ask a serious question. Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the traders of the district have refused to supply this man with the necessaries of life?

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Why not?

MR. BIRRELL: No, Sir. I hear that also for the first time.

Irish Land Finance.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, of the £31,633,776 estates in the hands of the Estates Commissioners on 16th February last, there are a sufficient number so far advanced as regards title to absorb the whole of the £371,628 now lying to the credit of the Estates Commissioners and bearing no interest; and, if so, whether he will explain the non-payment out immediately of this ready money.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that in all cases advances are made as soon as the necessary preliminary steps have been completed. There are, at all times, some cases which, though ripe for advances so far as title is concerned, are not ready in other respects; but as soon as a case is completed in every respect the advance is made.

CAPTAIN CRAIG asked the right hon. Gentleman if he would, in the interests of both tenants and landlord, press on the payment for estates out of the £371,628 now in hand and bearing no interest?

MR. BIRRELL: Nothing distresses me more than the delay that occurs in the completion of these matters, and I am using even now more than my powers to endeavour to accelerate things in every possible respect.

Evicted Tenants—Delays in Settling Claims.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland in reference to the removal of inspectors from one district to another, whether the Commissioners are aware that in many cases the files relating to evicted tenants' claims are handed over by the outgoing inspector to new men who have to begin *de novo* the investigation of estates previously examined and in some instances reported on; is he aware that in the union districts of Kanturk and Millstreet, County Cork, three inspectors have been successively engaged in inquiring into the question of evicted tenants and untenanted lands within the past twelve months; and whether the Commissioners will consider the advisability of making more permanent the stay of the inspectors in the different districts to which they have been appointed.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners are aware that in three instances in County Cork it was necessary, owing to the promotion or retirement of an inspector, to transfer the files of papers relating to evicted tenants to another inspector. It was unavoidable that some inconvenience and delay should be caused in these cases, but such a state of things is quite exceptional.

MR. FLYNN: Is it not the fact that the constant changing of inspectors materially retards the work of restoring these tenants to their holdings?

MR. BIRRELL: It is most undesirable, I admit, that there should be so much delay, but I am afraid that these changes are unavoidable.

Mr. Blennerhasset's Killorglin Estate.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that decrees have been issued against a number of tenants on the Arthur Blennerhasset estate, near Killorglin; and, in view of the suggestion already made that the Estates Commissioners should use their influence to promote a settlement of the purchase negotiations, can he say whether any, and, if so, what action has been taken in the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have communicated with the solicitors for the owner offering their services as conciliators under the Lord-Lieutenant's regulations of the 13th February, 1906, and have been informed in reply that the owner is not prepared to give any better terms to the tenants on the Killorglin portion of his property than those given to the other tenants. The solicitors also state that no proceedings have been taken against the tenants save those that would be taken in the ordinary course owing to their not having paid the September 1906 rent at the usual time, viz, February and March 1907. In the circumstances the Commissioners do not consider that they can further intervene in the matter.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that processes and executions were issued against twenty-five of these tenants for rents—a very unusual proceeding?

MR. BIRRELL: I am told that attempts were made to recover rent in the ordinary course.

Irish National School Buildings.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland when the new standard plans and specifications for national school buildings in Ireland will be ready; and whether he will, in the meantime, make public the principles which have been agreed upon, and the correspondence which has taken place on the subject between the National Board, the Irish Government, and the Treasury, so that the Irish people may have some opportunity of considering the matter and letting their views be known.

MR. BIRRELL: A conference will be held as soon as possible between representatives of the Commissioners of National Education and of the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland for the purpose of preparing sketch plans carrying out the principles which have been agreed upon. To work out detailed plans similar to those now in use, to lithograph them, and to prepare and print the corresponding specification will occupy some months, but urgent cases, I am informed, could be dealt with by means of specially adapted copies of the sketch plans to be prepared. The main principles that have been agreed upon are that the floor space to be provided shall be ten square feet upon the mean between the number in average attendance and the number on the rolls, and that there is to be a separate room for each adult teacher provided, according to circumstances, by means of movable partitions or by the building of actually separate rooms. Apart from the general objections to publishing inter-departmental correspondence, I do not think that the publication of the letters would give the Irish people an opportunity of considering the matter, inasmuch as the most important of the discussions which preceded the settlement arrived at took place at personal interviews.

Drimoleague Dispensary Doctor.

Mr. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that, in connection with the election of a dispensary doctor for the Drimoleague district by the Skibbereen Board of Guardians, Mr. R. O'Driscoll said that the Skibbereen union was a disgrace to humanity, and that he was ashamed of being a guardian of the union, and that Messrs. O'Sullivan and Walsh said they hoped the matter would come before the Judge at the next assizes; and whether the Local Government Board will direct an inquiry to be made as to whether these references had relation to allegations of bribery made against some members of the board.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am informed that according to a local newspaper report of the proceedings in this matter the three guardians referred to made the observations attributed to them in the Question. The Local Government Board have since been requested by two other guardians to order a sworn inquiry into the election of medical officer in view of the allegations of bribery and corruption, and have intimated their willingness to order an inquiry on being furnished with definite particulars.

Sacred Society of Clooney.

Viscount TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a threatening letter was recently received by Mr. H. de L. Willis, J.P., agent to Sir Bindon Blood, demanding, under pain of an untimely death, that he should deal with Cranagha farm in the manner dictated by the Sacred Society of Clooney; and whether he proposes to prosecute the Sacred Society of Clooney for threats to murder.

Mr. BIRRELL: It was reported to the police that Mr. Willis received an anonymous letter to the effect stated in the Question. The farm referred to is a large grazing farm, and it appears that certain persons in the locality are anxious to have it distributed. The police have no knowledge of any sacred or secret society at Clooney, and have no reason to believe that any such society exists.

Alleged Moonlighting in Galway.

Sir BERKELEY SHEFFIELD (Lincolnshire, Brigg): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received police information to the effect that Mr. Smith, of Colmanstown, county Galway, was recently ordered by some neighbouring tenants to surrender his farm for distribution amongst them; that, on his refusing to do so, they proceeded to intimidate his steward, but without effect; that on 15th March a moonlighting gang visited the steward's residence and fired six gunshots into his apartments; will he say whether any arrests followed this attack; and, if so, with what result.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am informed by the police authorities that Mr. Smith was visited by a deputation, who asked him whether he would sell his farm for distribution among the neighbouring tenants, and he replied in the negative. Subsequently, on the night of 15th March, several shots were fired through the windows of his steward's house. The police have made every effort to discover the offenders, but so far without success. No arrests have consequently been made.

Captain DONELAN (Cork, E.): As regards this Question, Sir, may I ask you whether hon. Members are entitled to utilise the Order Book of the House of Commons for the purpose of maligning and defaming the character of the Irish people?

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Any hon. Member who puts down a Question makes himself responsible for his belief in the facts in the Question. I cannot say that this Question is not in order.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I would appeal to you, Sir, to ask the hon. and gallant Member to withdraw the expression that a Question of this kind is put down by an hon. Member for the purpose of maligning and defaming his fellow-countrymen.

Mr. MOORE (Armagh, N.): I wish to know, Sir, whether it is in order for the hon. and gallant Member to attribute motives to other Members of the House?

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is not in order for an hon. Member to attribute motives to other Members of the House.

Captain DONELAN: I should like to ask you, Sir, whether any hon. Member of this House honestly believes that these Questions are put down for the purpose of eliciting information.

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is a matter of opinion. It is a fundamental rule of the House that an hon. Member must not attribute bad motives to other hon. Members.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT: I would ask you, Sir, to request the hon. and gallant Member to withdraw the expression that these Questions are put down for the purpose of maligning and defaming the character of the Irish people. It is most offensive.

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have ruled that the expression is out of order, and I have no doubt the hon. and gallant Member will withdraw it.

Captain DONELAN: Out of respect for you, Sir, I will withdraw the expression. I am sorry I have hit hon. Members above the gangway so very hard.

Lisevine Evicted Tenant.

Mr. CREAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid Cork, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have received an application for reinstatement from John Barry, of 1, Ballinlough Road, Cork, who claims to have been evicted from a farm at Lisevine, in the parish of Grenagh, county Cork; was the claim of Mr. Barry referred to Mr. Macoun, estates inspector, for inquiry and report; did Mr. Macoun wait upon the planter, a man named Connell, and did the latter offer to give up the holding if he were properly compensated or provided with another farm elsewhere; and, having regard to all the circumstances of this case, will he state what action the Estates Commissioners propose to take in the matter.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that the application in question was investigated by their inspector, who interviewed both the applicant and the present occupier of the holding. The latter intimated that he had no intention of giving up the farm. The Commissioners have therefore been unable to effect Barry's reinstatement, but will reconsider the question of providing him with another holding if opportunity should offer.

Mr. M. F. Barry's Cooldorihy Tenantry.

Mr. CREAN: On behalf of the hon. Member for Mid Cork, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that two bodies of tenants on the estate of M. F. Barry in lunacy have signed agreements to purchase their holdings on certain terms; that there are, however, a number of tenants holding farms at Cooldorihy, near Macroom, who claim to be a separate estate, inasmuch as they live in a different part of the country from the other purchasing tenants, and that therefore they are entitled to negotiate independently for their own interests; that they have submitted proposals for purchase to the Registrar in Lunacy through the Receiver, Mr. R. M. J. Townsend, and in the alternative of the non-acceptance of these proposals they have asked for a special inspection by the Estates Commissioners; will he say why these proposals have been rejected; will he state what action the Estates Commissioners propose to take in the matter; and whether they will order an early inspection of the holdings of these men, who have been threatened with legal proceedings unless they pay up their old rents.

Mr. BIRRELL: The matter of this estate is in lunacy under the jurisdiction of the Lord Chancellor. The Registrar in Lunacy informs me that the tenants referred to in the Question have been offered terms of purchase identical with those recently accepted by the tenants on the other portions of the property. The Lord Chancellor has been unable to distinguish between the two sets of tenants, or to discover any ground upon which one set should receive more favourable terms than the other. The terms offered are the lowest upon which the Lord Chancellor would feel justified in sanctioning a sale. The Estates Commissioners do not propose to intervene in the matter at the present stage, but they will, when inspecting the remainder of the estate, also inspect the holdings of these particular tenants with the view of considering how they should be dealt with. The inspection, however, cannot take place for some time, seeing that the purchase agreements have only recently been lodged.

Gargrie Labourer's Cottage.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the application of James Reilly, of Gargrie, Ballinamuck, who made application for a labourer's cottage in that division, was rejected at the preliminary hearing by the rural district council; and whether he will direct that this man's case be dealt with by the inspector, and inquired into when the public inquiry is held.

MR. BIRRELL: It is the fact that this man's application was rejected by the district council. It is open to him to attend at the local inquiry and lay his case before the inspector.

Dring Evicted Tenant.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether any application for reinstatement as an evicted tenant has been received from Mrs. Anne Smyth, of Derrycassan, Dring, near Granard, who, with her husband and three children, was evicted from the lands of Springtown nearly twenty-seven years ago; and whether, as the estate from which she was evicted is now being sold through the Estates Commissioners, care will be taken that this woman's case will receive consideration, with a view to her reinstatement.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners have received the application in question, and have referred it to an inspector for inquiry and report.

Granard Council and the Irish Pig Trade.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the last quarterly meeting of the Granard Urban Council a resolution was passed strongly protesting against the present restrictions upon the importation of Irish store pigs into Great Britain; and whether he can announce when it is proposed to modify or withdraw these restrictions.

MR. BIRRELL: The regulations to which the Question refers were issued by the Board of Agriculture and Fisheries. I am not aware of any present intention on the part of that Board to modify the regulations, but upon that point the hon. Member should address my hon. friend the Member for South Somerset.

Maconchy Estate Turbary Trustee.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether Mr. Michael Kiernan, D.C., of Lettergonnell, Ballinamuck, has been removed from the position of a turbary trustee on the Maconchy estate, and, if so, the grounds upon which this step has been taken.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that Mr. Kiernan was one of five turbary trustees originally nominated in connection with this estate. Mr. Kiernan, however, declined to act except on conditions which were impracticable, and he failed to attend a meeting to which he was summoned for the consideration of the matter in dispute. In these circumstances the Commissioners have agreed to his exclusion from the position.

Longford Estate Duty Grant.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, on 26th March last, the Local Government Board wrote to the Longford County Council, intimating to them for the first time that their estate duty grant of £1,428 14s. 11d., and a further sum of £36 7s. 1d., out of the agricultural grant had been deducted to make good to the Commissioners of National Debt the loss which had accrued in respect of land purchase in county Longford; will he say why this announcement was kept back for two years, and why it was only then made when the county council had made out its financial budget for the current year, and could not without great loss of time and money recast their rates; and will he see that in future transactions of this kind the council will get due notice so as to have time to examine into the alleged deficits.

MR. BIRRELL: The fact is as stated in the first part of the Question. The amount which should have been deducted last year is £659 8s. 4d. I have already explained that by a clerical oversight, which is regretted, the certificates were not forwarded to the Local Government Board in time for the deduction to be made for last year's payment. I have also stated that I am in communication with the Treasury with the object of devising some means whereby county councils may receive, before striking their rates, notice of the amount coming to them from the Local Taxation Account.

Irish Language in Irish Schools.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether a new scheme for the teaching of Irish in national schools has yet been sanctioned by the Treasury; and, if so, will he give the details of it.

MR. BIRRELL: I am in active communication with the Treasury on this subject. The matter has not yet been settled.

CAPTAIN CRAIG: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of not issuing any new scheme for the teaching of Irish, costing so much money, in view of the deplorable condition of so many Irish school buildings?

MR. BIRRELL: That very important question has not escaped my attention.

Killarney Affray.

MR. LONSDALE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any particulars of the affray which took place on Saturday near Killarney; whether a body of men attacked four bailiffs who were attempting to distrain some cattle for rent, and two of the bailiffs were seriously injured; and what action he proposes to take in reference to this matter.

SIR BERKELEY SHEFFIELD: May I at the same time ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a police report concerning an attack made on Saturday night, the 27th inst., near Killarney, by a body of men armed with pikes and pitchforks, upon Lord Kenmare's bailiffs, who were engaged in attempting to distrain some cattle for rent; and whether any arrests have been made on account of this assault.

MR. BIRRELL: I have received police reports as to this occurrence. It is alleged that one man—not a body of men—attacked the bailiffs with a pitchfork. This man has been arrested, and the proceedings against him are pending. In the circumstances it would be undesirable to enter into details. This Answer applies also to the similar Question of the hon. Member for the Brigg Division.

MR. FLYNN: Is it not the fact that an execution was being made for a half year's rent, when the bailiffs fired shots on the people, who simply defended themselves?

[No Answer was returned.]

Irish Intermediary Schools.

MR. GWYNN (Galway): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland on what grounds the system of inspection of modern language teaching by oral examination has been discontinued in Irish intermediary schools; whether his attention has been called to a letter from Archbishop Walsh, who is a member of the Board of Intermediate Education, declaring that the responsibility for stopping this system rests neither with the Board nor with the Treasury, but with some controlling authorities at Dublin Castle; and, if so, will he indicate the authorities referred to.

MR. BIRRELL: I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer given by my predecessor to Questions on this subject put by the hon. Member for South Kerry on 21st and 29th March, 1906.† Those

---

† See (4) *Debates*, cliv., 386, 1545.

Answers are still applicable. The only inspection of schools which the Board of Intermediate Education have carried out was that performed by temporary inspectors in the years 1901, 1902, and 1903. The Board desired that a permanent inspectorate should be appointed, but, for reasons which have already been stated, the Government were unable to agree. The Government, however, were prepared to approve of the re-appointment of temporary inspectors, but the Board declined to accept the proposal,

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I hope a better system of secondary education in Ireland will be inaugurated by the Bill shortly to be brought in by the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. BIRRELL: I hope so too.

Irish Department of Agriculture.

MR. WALTER LONG (Dublin, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will cause the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee of Inquiry into the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland to be printed and circulated without delay.

MR. BIRRELL: I have communicated with the Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry, who informs me that the evidence is substantially ready for publication, and as there seems to be a desire that it should be published at once, I will arrange for its presentation to Parliament as soon as possible.

Carrick-on-Shannon Disturbance.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Thursday last a member of the local district council, named Martin Cooney, of Hill Street, Carrick-on-Shannon, complained to District Inpector Steadman that one of a body of police under the orders of the latter had, on a bridge leading to the town, assaulted him with his baton, and seeing that Cooney asked for the name of his assailant, which the district inspector refused to give, he will give instructions that the name shall be furnished; and whether in future policemen in Ireland will be supplied with distinguishing badges as in England and Scotland.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed by the police authorities that Mr. Cooney was a member of a crowd which attempted to force a police cordon in the circumstances mentioned in my reply to the Question of the hon. Member for Mid Armagh on 25th April. The police were ordered to draw batons, and Mr. Cooney, who repeatedly threw himself on the police, was during the scuffle struck with a baton by a constable. The district inspector refused at the moment to give the name of the constable, saying that he himself was responsible. He has, however, since been instructed to give the constable's name to Mr. Cooney. I understand that the question of supplying the force with distinguishing badges has frequently been considered, but that it has been thought inexpedient to adopt such a course.

King-Harman Estate.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a man named M'Drury, a householder and owner of property in the town of Boyle, county Roscommon, had a house and plot of land on the King-Harman estate transferred to him by the Estates Commissioners, and that the house in question was at the time occupied by another tenant; whether there was any special reason why the latter should be passed over and the property bestowed upon M'Drury; whether M'Drury afterwards sold by auction his interest in the house and land for £211; whether he is aware that M'Drury had never expended anything upon improving the concern; and whether the Estates Commissioners will cancel sales of this character, as being contrary to the spirit of the Land Act.

MR. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that in 1905 advances were made to John M'Drury for the purchase of two small holdings on the King-Harman estate, one at Boyle and the other at Termon. The Commissioners have not been notified of any change of ownership, and M'Drury is therefore still liable for the payment of the annuities. The Commissioners have no information that another person was at the time of the sale in occupation of either of the holdings or any part of them, nor are they aware that the tenant-purchaser has since parted with his interest.

Intermediate Education in Ireland.

Mr. KETTLE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of schools that obtained grants under the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Acts in each year from 1900 to 1906; also the number of students who presented themselves for the examinations of the Intermediate Education Board and the number who passed in each of these years.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Answer to this Question consists of a tabular statement of figures which I will have circulated with to-night's Votes.† I will also, with the hon. Member's permission, adopt a similar course in regard to his Questions No. 43 and 44 addressed to the Secretary to the Treasury which my hon. friend has asked me to answer.

The two Questions referred to in the Answer were as follows:—

Mr. KETTLE: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury what was the total amount of the school grant paid by the Intermediate Education Board (Ireland) to managers of Irish secondary schools in the years 1903, 1904, 1905, and 1906 respectively; and what was the rate of payment for each successful pupil in each of these years.

Mr. KETTLE: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the income derived by the Intermediate Education Board (Ireland) under Section 3 of the Local Taxation (Customs and Excise) Act, 1890, in each year from 1900 to 1906; and also the total income of the Board in each of those years.

Irish Evicted Tenants.

Mr. HAYDEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state whether the investigations into the claims of the evicted tenants of Ireland for reinstatement under the Act of 1903 have been completed; if not, whether he can give any idea as to the number of cases in which the investigations have been made, and when the entire work will be completed; and whether he can give the results of the investigations made up to the present.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that of the 6,680 applications received up to 5th February last, 5,321 have been investigated, and they expect that the remaining 1,359 will be investigated by the end of May, the date mentioned by me on the 14th February last as the date on which it was hoped that the inquiries into these applications would be completed. I do not propose to make any detailed statement as to the result of investigations until the end of this month.

Sligo Grant Deduction.

Mr. P. A. McHUGH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury when did the Local Government Board for Ireland become aware that a sum of £1,500 was to be stopped from the grants due to the county council of Sligo in March, 1907; when was the fact communicated to the secretary of the county council of Sligo; can he state approximately the amount which will be stopped from grants payable to Sligo County Council in March, 1908; what portion of the £1,500 was stopped on account of unpaid annuities; and what is the amount of annuities now due and unpaid in Sligo county.

Mr. BIRRELL: My hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. The Local Government Board were notified of the liabilities of all the counties on 26th February last. The calculations as to the deductions to be made from each of the local bodies in all the counties were completed as soon as possible, and on 26th March the Sligo County Council were informed of their share in the grant. The amounts which may have to be deducted from grants to county councils in respect of the current financial year will not be known till towards the end of the year. The deduction on account of unpaid annuities in Sligo was £235. I am inquiring as to the amount of the annuities at present unpaid, and will inform the hon. Member of the result.

---

† See cols. 847–850.

Mr. JOYCE (Limerick): Is a deduction also made in the case of Irish borough councils?

Mr. BIRRELL: I will inquire.

North Belfast Election.

Mr. J. DEVLIN: I beg to ask Mr. Attoney-General for Ireland whether his attention has been called to the public protest from a number of voters who were debarred from exercising the franchise at the recent election in North Belfast; whether he is aware that, at the preparation of the register on which the election took place, men who were fully qualified to vote, and who had voted at the two previous elections, were removed from the voters' list without notice; that in some instances the names of voters qualified in North Belfast were removed from the list of that division and placed on the lists of other divisions of the city where they had no qualification whatever; that the voters so disfranchised in North Belfast were well known to be supporters of the democratic cause; whether he is aware that the preparation of the registers is in the hands of local officials who make no secret of their antagonism to everything progressive; and whether he will cause an inquiry to be made into the whole matter, with a view to inquiring into this tampering with the register, and to prevent the repetition of such an occurrence.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Cherry, Liverpool, Exchange): I have made inquiries as to the irregularities referred to in the Question. The Deputy Clerk of the Crown and Peace informs me that he is only aware of two specific cases at the recent election for North Belfast where persons claiming to be Parliamentary voters for the division were found not to be on the register. In both cases the names of these gentlemen appeared on the register for other divisions of Belfast, in one case for West Belfast, and in the other for South Belfast, and their names were placed on the Local Government supplement only for North Belfast. In one case, at all events, this course appears to have been wrongly taken, as the voter states that he has no qualification at all for South Belfast, but I do not think that one error in a large register is sufficient evidence of partiality to base a charge against the officials who prepare the register. Should any evidence be placed before me of anything like a systematic attempt by any official to exclude persons of one particular Party from the register, I shall cause full inquiries to be made into the matter so as to prevent any such illegal and improper action.

Irish Uneconomic Holdings.

Mr. GINNELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury has the Treasury made any attempt to ascertain or estimate the proportion of rents of uneconomic holdings in Ireland usually paid with money received from relatives in exile, or the probable consequences of failure of that supply on the occupants becoming nominal purchasers within the zones at prices based upon those uneconomic rents; and will the Treasury consider the advisability of requiring the rule in the Blake-Foster case to be applied in all such cases.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The Answer to the first part of the Question is in the negative. The application of the principles established by the decision in the Blake-Foster case rests with the Estates Commissioners and not with the Treasury, but I am informed that the Commissioners act on those principles in all cases in which in their opinion they apply.

The Earl of Portsmouth and his Tenants.

Mr. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister, in view of the recent expulsion of one of his tenants by the Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for War for having exercised his legal rights under the Ground Game Act, whether he has yet obtained a confirmation of the facts alleged; if so, what action does he intend taking to protect the tenants of this noble landowner; and whether, in view of his recent speech on land reform, he proposes to permit this Member of the Government to continue to hold office.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): Is the hon. Gentleman in order in bringing before the House the relations of an individual landlord with an individual tenant who has his remedy in the law courts?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Question is in order.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): It is no part of my duty, nor is it in my power, to protect any body of tenants from the landowner from whom they hold their tenancy, nor the landowner from his tenants. They have certain rights with regard to each other which are defined by the law, and the Prime Minister is not the Court to decide any dispute between them. I have received a letter from Lord Portsmouth, which I propose to read to the House. He says, "In reply to the allegations made against me, I would briefly state that the tenant in question, a Mr. Parsons, had truly been a tenant on my estate for many years; but he had only been enabled to occupy the farm so long because my father and I had from time to time given him very substantial assistance in abatements and remissions of rent. He was not given notice to quit for any *bona fide*, fair, and reasonable exercise of any rights under the Ground Game Act, but because, owing to his impecuniosity and absence of stock, the farm was rapidly deteriorating. As to the supposed grievance of loss from excessive ground game, the absurdity of such a statement is proved by the fact that, as soon as ever he quitted the farm, it was taken by the actually adjoining tenant at an increased rent." Lord Portsmouth adds that he has not an acre untenanted or a shilling of arrear upon his estate in Hampshire.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): Did not the letter of Lord Portsmouth contain these words, "If you or any other tenant insist upon your powers under the Game Act and constantly disturb the land in pursuit of ground game, I must at once and frankly say I must take the only remedy I possess of changing tenants or farming the land myself?" May I also ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the landlord thought it right not only to take into his own hands the improvements this tenant had made, but actually insisted on a claim for dilapidation for some of the improvements which the tenant himself had made?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware of these facts. The letter to which reference was made was written two or three years ago, and I am not acquainted with the circumstances in any respect; but I have read the letter Lord Portsmouth has written to me with reference to the actual position at this time.

MR. LEA: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he is aware that the tenant in question is in possession of a letter from the late Lord Portsmouth in which these words occur: "If every landlord had as good and straightforward and honourable a tenant as you are, a lot of landlords would be in a very different position." Is the right hon. Gentleman also aware that in the county of Hampshire this noble landowner——

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I do not think that is a supplementary Question which ought to be asked. The Prime Minister cannot be expected to have a knowledge of the correspondence between the late Lord Portsmouth and his tenants.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is not any part of my duty to adjust rights and wrongs between a tenant and his landlord.

MR. WALTER LONG: May I remind the Prime Minister—[Cries of "Order"] then may I ask the right hon. Gentleman if in answer to a general Question the other day in this House he did not state that the Government were closely watching the operation of the Act to which reference had been made, and would be prepared to take action if any attempt were made to evade it?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware that this comes under that category. I hardly think it does; but if it does, then when the case is settled one way or the other it will be a fact that we shall take into account in considering the effect of legislation.

LORD R. CECIL: When the Prime Minister said the letter was written two or three years ago was he aware that the tenant went out last Michaelmas?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The tenant's going out last Michaelmas does not prevent its being true that the letter was written two or three years ago.

MR. LEA: Is it not a matter of common notoriety in the county of Hampshire that this landowner——

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is not a proper supplementary Question.

CAPTAIN FABER: Is that undesirable tenant now within a stone's throw on another landowner's property?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That Question does not properly arise.

MR. FLAVIN: As this is likely to become an historical subject, may I ask if the Prime Minister will inform the House how many tenants have been removed from the Scottish estates of Balfour and Co.?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the Prime Minister's Answer.

The Imperial Conference.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) asked the Prime Minister whether a verbatim report of the discussion now proceeding at the Imperial Conference on preferential trade within the Empire will be published, or whether it was intended to confine the debate given to the public to such meagre summaries as were published in this morning's papers.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have explained again and again that we have no control in the matter. Whatever action is taken as to publication or non-publication or delayed publication is under the instruction of the Conference itself. I am sure of this—there will be no different treatment, no preferential treatment given to one subject over another. I understand—I speak with no authority—but I have been told that it is probable, and perhaps a little more than probable, that a full report will be published after the Conference is closed. That I believe is in accordance with the desire of the members of the Conference themselves.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, after explaining that he put the Question, not as matter of complaint against the Government, but to the Prime Minister as president of the Conference [SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: "No, no," and HON. MEMBERS: "Not yet"], in order to obtain information, asked whether, if any question arose as to full publication, the influence of the Government would be exercised on the side of publicity.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have no information in the matter. It is in the hands of the Conference. I do not believe for a moment that any different treatment will be applied to one subject as compared with another.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe) asked whether the matter of the fullness or meagreness of the reports was decided by vote.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware. I do not know. It has never come to a vote there, I am told, certainly not upon this occasion. But I may at once dispel the darkness that appears to pervade some quarters by saying that, as far as I am concerned and my colleagues in the Government, so far from objecting to publication, we hope every syllable will be published.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR AND MR. BIRRELL'S SPEECH AT HALIFAX.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: I rise, Sir, for the purpose of asking you to permit me to make a personal explanation. Last Monday I addressed a Question to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant in these words—

> "To ask the right hon. Gentleman to what hon. Members he referred when he stated that there were men in the House of Commons who made it their business at Question time day after day to ask Questions, not for the purpose of gaining information, but to malign and misrepresent the people of Ireland."

The right hon. Gentleman in his reply said that—

> "The words were a condensation of what he actually said, which was that, as Questions were constantly put to him which evidently added nothing to the information of the persons asking them or of the police, who were responsible for the peace of Ireland, or to his information, it would seem that the only object in putting them was to create a false impression in England of the real state of things in Ireland."

The Question which I put was based upon the following report in *The Times* newspaper—

> "There are found, I am sorry to say, in the ranks of Irishmen themselves, men in the

House of Commons who make it their business day after day during the time of Questions to fix like carrion crows upon the one or two places in Ireland where there is this ground for disturbance and to ask questions relative thereto, not for the purpose of gaining information, for they have all the information already, not for the purpose of calling the attention of the police to these places, for the police know ten times more than they do, not for the purpose of calling my attention to these places, because I know them perfectly well and think of them day and night. No, their sole object is to malign and misrepresent their native country in the eyes of the English people, who have not the opportunities which I enjoy of knowing the true facts of the case, and who cannot of their own knowledge know how confined and limited are these areas of disorder."

This verbatim report in *The Times* is borne out by the following newspapers:—the *Yorkshire Observer*——

MR. BELLOC (Salford, S.): I rise to order, Sir. Is the hon. Member in order in making his proposed apology.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is a personal explanation.

MR. BELLOC: I only rose to call attention to this point because the hon. Member says that this statement is borne out by another vebatim report.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The noble Lord will be in order if he confines himself to the accusation and his personal explanation.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: If the hon. Gentleman had allowed me to finish my sentence it is possible that he might have understood my object. The right hon. Gentleman stated at the time, in reply to my Questions, that this report was a condensed report. As the version given of his speech by the right hon. Gentleman differed entirely from *The Times* report, I, in accordance with the custom of the House, tendered an apology to the right hon. Gentleman because *The Times* report must be false. Since then I have read the other verbatim reports of the same speech, and I can no longer describe *The Times* report as false. I apologise to *The Times* newspaper. I do not suggest that the right hon. Gentleman's version of his speech was incorrect; I offer no explanation; but apparently some one has blundered.

MR. BIRRELL: I am sorry that any speech of mine should have occasioned the waste of time and the attention that has been given to it. I should like, however, to remind the noble Lord that when I spoke of a condensed report I was not referring to *The Times*, because I had not then, nor have I now, seen the report of the speech in *The Times*. My speech was delivered at a meeting on Friday, and next day I was in the north of England, and, being more pleasantly engaged, I did not see *The Times* on that day, and I do not propose to see it now. The condensation I referred to was that which appeared in the question of the noble Lord, and that obviously was a very condensed report. Speaking from memory, and having no means of correcting my recollection, for I spoke entirely without notes, I gave the House what I believe I did say—at all events, what I hope I said. To the best of my recollection what I said was that I racked my brains to discover some motive which was prompting these hon. Members in continuing to put to me these Questions; and then I added that it seemed to me as if they could have no other motive except what I proceeded to say. I will not quarrel with the reporter. One reporter—the reporter of the *Bradford Observer*—seemed to me to have given a very accurate and verbatim report, though I agree that he did not give the phrase the turn I intended to give it myself; and therefore, it is very likely, not being a master of speech like the noble Lord——

VISCOUNT TURNOUR: A cheap jest.

MR. BIRRELL: It is not a jest at all. I can only say, therefore, and I am willing to say, that I am very sorry if I used language that seemed to impute improper motives to hon. Members sitting in that part of the House.

MR. T. L. CORBETT: It was insulting.

MR. BIRRELL: Well, I can only express my regret for having used it.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

SIR WILLIAM GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee A: Mr. Beauchamp (added in respect of the Advertisements Regulation Bill); and had appointed, in substitution, Mr. Gooch (in respect of the Advertisements Regulation Bill).

SIR WILLIAM GURDON further reported from the Committee; That they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill): Mr. Ainsworth and Mr. Whitehead; and had appointed, in substitution, Mr. Radford and Sir Frederick Cawley. Reports to lie upon the Table.

HOUSE OF COMMONS (KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS).

First Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 135.]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (WAYS AND MEANS).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the proceedings on Report of the Committee of Ways and Means, if under discussion when the Business is postponed this day, be resumed and proceeded with, though opposed, after the interruption of Business."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 305; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 151.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Ambrose, Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (S'merset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Bennett, E. N.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, R'mf'rd)
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, Rt. Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Chas.
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert

Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness)
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles

Ferens, T. R.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, Colonel Ivor (Mon., S.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N)
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jardine, Sir J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)

Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire)
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, EdmundG.(Leominster)
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea,HughCecil(St.Pancras,E.)
Leese,SirJoseph F.(Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Maclean, Donald
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down,S.)
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal,E)
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, Sir C. B. (Leicester)
M'Micking, Major G.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, W. Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Montagu, E. S.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip
Morse, L. L.
Myer, Horatio
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M. (Suffolk,Eye)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Priestley, W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Rea, Walter Rusell (Scarboro')
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th)
Richards, T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Rickett, J. Compton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson,Rt.Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'd)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Schwann,Sir C. E.(Manchester)
Scott,A.H.(Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Rt. Hn. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(SomersetE)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Ward, W.Dudley(South'mpt'n)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson,J.W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras,S.)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,Rt Hn.A.J.(City Lond)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G.(Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Clark,George Smith (Belfast,N)
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingh'm)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craig,Captain James(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Du Cros, Harvey
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of

Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm's
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Jenkins, J.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareh'm)
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesh'm)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Nield, Herbert
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Percy, Earl
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
Younger, George.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

WAYS AND MEANS [18TH APRIL] REPORT.

Resolutions reported.

TEA.

1. "That the Customs duty now charged on tea shall continue to be charged until the first day of July, nineteen hundred and eight (that is to say)—Tea, the pound, five pence."

CONTINUANCE OF ADDITIONAL CUSTOMS DUTIES ON TOBACCO, BEER, AND SPIRITS.

2. "That the additional Customs duties on tobacco, beer, and spirits imposed by Sections two, three, four, and five of the Finance Act, 1900 (including any increased duties imposed by Section five of that Act), shall continue to be charged until Parliament otherwise determine."

CONTINUANCE OF ADDITIONAL EXCISE DUTIES ON BEER AND SPIRITS.

3. "That the additional Excise duties on beer and spirits imposed by Sections six and seven of the Finance Act, 1900, shall continue to be charged until Parliament otherwise determine."

HIRE PURCHASE AGREEMENT.

4. "That a hire-purchase agreement shall be charged with stamp duty as an agreement, or, if under seal, or in Scotland, with a clause of registration as a deed, as the case requires, and shall not in any case be exempt from stamp duty as an agreement, letter, or memorandum made for or relating to the sale of any goods, wares, or merchandise."

ESTATE DUTY (FINANCE ACT, 1896, s. 21).

5.—"That the deduction allowed under section twenty-one of the Finance Act, 1896, on account of the previous payment of duty on property shall (instead of being calculated as provided by that section) be taken to be the amount which would be payable on account of the duty on the property if the duty were calculated on the value of the property upon which estate duty is payable."

PERMANENT ANNUAL CHARGE.

6.—"That the permanent annual charge for the National Debt for the current financial year be twenty-nine and a-half million pounds."

AMENDMENT OF LAW.

7.—"That it is expedient to amend the law relating to the National Debt, Customs, and Inland Revenue."

First Resolution read a second time.

MR. FLETCHER (Hampstead) moved to substitute 4d. for 5d. as the amount of the tea duty. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said in his Budget speech that he was satisfied that a reduction of 1d. on the tea duty would not benefit the consumer. If that were so why did the right hon. Gentleman take off 1d. last year? The grocer with whom he dealt complained to him last year that to take off only 1d. was not enough, and that it would not affect the retail price; but that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had reduced the duty from 6d. to 4d., the retail grocers would have been able to grant some advantage to the poor consumer. A great deal was heard at the last general election about the iniquity of taxes on the food of the poor. The hon. Gentleman who represented him in the House of Commons sent him then a very ornamental card with his portrait upon it, and underneath the legend "No taxes on food." He hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would rectify his error in not taking off another 1d. from the tea duty, so that the consumer might get some benefit. He begged to move.

*MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye), in seconding, said that last year in introducing his Budget the Chancellor of the Exchequer used those words, according to the Official Report—

> "I have had the percentages taken out of the taxation on the average value of articles of food charged with customs duty, and that on tea is 90 per cent. And if you take the cheaper qualities of tea, the percentage, of course, would be much higher. A reduction, however small, on the tea duty has, as compared with other remissions of taxation, several distinct advantages of its own. In the first place, tea being an article which does not undergo, after importation, more or less elaborate process of manufacture or manipulation, the lowering of the tax is not intercepted or delayed, but goes almost directly to the consumer."

He thought that that statement was very inconsistent with the words used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day. When the Finance Bill was before the House last year, he personally urged a further reduction on the tea duty, on the ground that a penny reduction would not benefit the poorest consumer; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer used the words he had quoted, in answer to his argument. But, assuming that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a great authority on the subject, they on the Opposition side of the House urged him even now to endeavour to take off another 1d. from the tea duty, or to make some readjustment of the tax by which it would fall on the value of the tea and not on the weight. The great bulk of the tea used in this country was consumed by the very poor, and it was in some cases taxed to the extent of 200 per cent. of its value. It was hardly consistent for a Liberal Government to allow that state of things to remain. Last year the Chancellor of the Exchequer held out the hope that this year he would be able to deal with the tea duty in a more satisfactory manner. The right hon. Gentleman shook his head; but although he had not the Budget speech with him he was sure that the right hon. Gentleman had held out the hope that he would give some relief to the tea consumer this year. It was on that ground that he and his friends felt justified in pressing this Amendment to a division.

Amendment proposed—

> "To leave out the word 'Five,' and insert the word 'Four.'"—(*Mr. Fletcher.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'Five," stand part of the said Resolution."

MR. ASQUITH said that he would be very glad to see the tea duty reduced to 4d., though he must confess that, as between the tea duty and the sugar duty, if he had the chance of dealing with indirect taxation at all, he would rather deal with the sugar duty, because tea, if in a sense a necessary of life, was rather on the luxury side of the line, while sugar was a real necessity as well as a raw material for a large number of industries. But he could not ask the House to accept this proposal—in the first place, because he could not afford to sacrifice the revenue; and, in the next place, because a reduction of 1d. in existing circumstances would not appreciably benefit the customer. Last year he gave reasons for the view he then held, and still held with modifications, that a reduction of 1d. on the 6d. duty would go to the consumer, either in diminished price or in improved quality. The reduction had gone to the consumer to a considerable extent in improved quality, though not much in diminished price. But the conditions of the tea trade had altered very much in the course of the year. There had been, for reasons not easy to determine, a large, and, perhaps, an abnormal, increase in the demand for Indian tea from foreign countries, and particularly from Russia, with the result that the wholesale price of tea had gone up, in spite of the reduction of duty, by something like a penny a lb., compared with this time last year. He had taken the trouble to ascertain the opinions of those most conversant with the matter, and he was advised that in the existing state of the trade, with this abnormal demand, a further reduction of a penny would certainly go to the producer or middleman, and very little to the consumer in this country. Weighing all these cumulative considerations, it appeared to him that, although he would like to see the tea duty brought back to the level at which it stood before the war—and it had already been reduced from the war rate of 8d. to 5d.—the proposal would not, in existing conditions, have any satisfactory economic or social result.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that the right hon. Gentleman's speech illustrated the exceeding fineness of the line which divided necessaries from luxuries when the general articles of consumption by the people were in question. Looked at from the point of view of a medical man suggesting a dietary, sugar was more important than tea. Could any one looking at the ordinary expenditure in a poor household draw a distinction between tea and sugar? If anything could be found in the cupboard at all there would be a little bread, tea, and sugar. It was impossible to make a fiscal distinction by the theoretical line the Chancellor of the Exchequer attempted to draw. What was the difference in the circumstances which made it likely that a reduction of a penny would reach the consumer last year and not this year? To that question the right hon. Gentleman had given no answer.

MR. ASQUITH said he gave an explicit answer when he referred to the conditions of the trade and an abnormal increase in foreign demands.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that answer appeared to be fatal to the whole body of the free-trade doctrine. The constant burden of the song of the right hon. Gentleman and his supporters was that the burden of a duty must fall on the consumer, never less, and sometimes more. But if a reduction would go to the middleman and grower, was it not equally likely that under certain conditions an increase would be borne by the middleman and producer?

MR. ASQUITH: In certain circumstances.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN thought the admissions elicited day by day would afford valuable material for argument.

MR. ASQUITH said there was no new admission; he had said over and over again, when referring to the ultimate burden falling on the consumer, that the tendency might be restrained or delayed by other temporary causes.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said, then when hon. Gentlemen opposite said in general terms that any tax raising the price of an article would be borne by the consumer they did not mean that, but that under certain conditions, and in certain temporary circumstances, a great proportion of it would fall on the trade. He was glad to have that admission. He was inclined to say that though in particular cases a reduction of a penny might inure to the benefit of the consumer, a reduction of 2d. would be more likely to do so, and therefore he regretted that the Amendment was not in favour of 2d. The right hon. Gentleman now thought that to some extent the reduction of last year did go to the consumer, a modest phrase compared to that used last year, when, owing to the circumstances of the case, the consumer was to have the whole. What were the particular circumstances? There happened to be in bond at the time a great quantity of inferior tea which the owners had a difficulty in disposing of, but a penny off the duty enabled them to put it on the market with that reduction in price. He did not think that was of much advantage to the consumer, if the Chancellor of the Exchequer's expectations were realised to the letter. There was an illustration this year of a fact known to every one who considered the question, that the incidence of a duty was one of many factors governing the price of the article affected, often the smallest of factors. If the duty was a material factor in fixing the price, then the price must be higher or lower in accordance with the duty. The refusal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to abate the duty on the ground he had given cut away the whole case upon which he and his friends had been accustomed to argue the question of duties, and introduced a little inconsistency into the arguments. For his own part he believed that a small duty on an article of general consumption supplied in very large quantities in a large market had but a very small effect on price in circumstances generally prevalent, and that the tax in a large measure fell on the producer. He regretted that the proposal was not for a reduction of 2d.; but he would vote for the Amendment as a protest against the narrow limits within which the Chancellor of the Exchequer confined his attempts to raise revenue, and as an expression of his belief that the time had come when they ought to seek for resources in a wider field, where, he believed, they could raise the necessary taxation with less hardship to individuals and to the general welfare of the country.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Worcestershire had made this discussion about tea the occasion for a general discussion about fiscal reform and the tariff question. He was reminded of the candidate who learnt up the binomial theorem, and, when it was not asked in the examination paper, began his answers by saying, "Before answering other questions it will be necessary to prove the binomial theorem." The right hon. Gentleman had deplored the fact that the poor people of this country had not got another penny off the tea duty, but he could not help remembering that it was the right hon. Gentleman and his friends who put this tax on, half of which had been remitted by the present Government. He sincerely hoped that when the Chancellor of the Exchequer could see his way to it, the other half would be taken off. There was one question he wished to put to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in reference to this duty. It had been stated that the right hon. Gentleman looked forward to the shilling income-tax and the duty on tea and sugar at their present rates as being permanent. That he knew was not the case, but perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would take the opportunity to say so?

MR. ASQUITH: I have said so already.

*MR. REES said he was glad to hear that, because there was undoubtedly an impression in the country that these taxes had been stereotyped at the present rates. He was glad that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had expressly and explicitly disavowed any such idea. It had been said that the poor received no benefit from the remission of a penny on the tea duty, but he submitted that they had received some benefit in the way of getting a better quality of tea. With the causes for present very high prices he had already dealt when the Budget was introduced, and the facts were admitted. There was another class of person who was seldom mentioned in the House who would get a benefit, and that was the tea-planter in India, who worked hard and deserved well of his country. No one indeed deserved better, and by no one had he as much as heard his name mentioned in the House since he himself spoke last year on this subject. In theory he agreed with the hon. Members who moved and seconded the Amendment, but it seemed to him that they were so exceedingly kind that they wanted to give away what they had not got. For this reason, although he was in whole-hearted sympathy with what had been said as to the desirability of a lower duty on tea, feeling that it was not practicable at the present moment, while the Chancellor of the Exchequer's present plans held the field, he should vote against the Amendment before the House. He hoped, however, that the time would come when a further reduction in the tea duty would be possible. He quite sympathised with the view that tea must be regarded almost as a necessity for the poor, just as much as sugar was, and he looked forward to a reduction of the duty on the latter, almost as anxiously as he did for a reduction of the duty on tea. For the Opposition who doubled the duty to censure the Government which was reducing it seemed to him absurd. They said "why take a penny; we would give twopence." And they did twice, but it was each time twopence on, not twopence off, and it was the cost of the war, in part, which now kept the duty up to the present high figure.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) said the hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs had advanced certain arguments in defence of the Amendment, and then said he was going to vote against it. He did not think that was a consistent course to take. Hon. Gentlemen opposite, as a matter of fact, only a few months ago, had denounced the tea duty throughout the length and breadth of the land but now when a reduction of it was moved they got up in their places and said that they were going to vote against the proposal. For himself he was going to maintain a consistent attitude. The speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer seemed to him to be so sound that he intended to vote with the right hon. Gentleman and against the Amendment. He had always been in favour of indirect taxation as against direct taxation, whereas hon. Members opposite had always taken the contrary view. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said he could not assent to a reduction of the tea duty by one penny a pound, because if he did so no benefit would accrue to the purchasing classes who consumed the article. The hon. Member for Montgomery Boroughs had said that if there was no reduction in price in consequence of the remission of the penny last year, there had been an improvement in quality; but how did the hon. Gentleman know that? Had he bought two years ago a sample of tea and compared it with a sample of tea which he had purchased at the present moment? In his opinion the quality of the tea which was being sold now was exactly the same as the quality of that which was sold two years ago, and in his view the retailer was selling the same tea and reaping the additional profit caused by the reduction. He quite agreed with the Chancellor of the Exchequer that small reductions made no difference to the consumer, and he congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on having at last got some glimmering of financial reasoning, and on having shown sufficient courage to oppose the statements made by about 99 per cent. of his followers, to the effect that they would do away with the tea duty if they were returned.

Mr. J. F. MASON (Windsor) observed that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that the tea and sugar duties were not permanent and were only maintained now because the expenses of the war were not yet paid off. He would point out that the war debt stood now at £138,000,000, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not suggest that the whole of the £20,000,000 of war taxes which were still kept on was for the service of that debt. The right hon. Gentleman was really maintaining war taxes to meet the ordinary expenses of the country. As regarded the question of the remission of a penny duty on tea, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said it was unnecessary to take it off because it would not be reflected in the price which the consumer paid. He thought, however, that the reduction of the duty would have a considerable effect upon the price paid by the consumer. The only conclusion at which he could arrive was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had considerably modified his view of last year.

Captain CRAIG (Down, E.) said he differed from the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London in the view he took on this matter, as, so far, he had himself consistently supported such a reduction of the tea duty as would be consistent with the Chancellor of the Exchequer's surplus. He wished to put in a plea for poor people who lived in country places rather than those who lived in large towns. He thought the evidence as to the reduction of 1d. on the tea duty last year tended to show that the poorer classes living in far country places had not benefited from it to any large extent. As was pointed out at the time the reduction was made, the inhabitants of country villages, small farmers and labourers, did not experience any appreciable difference, either in the quality of their tea or its price, as a result of the reduction of the tax by 1d.; whereas, it was held by those best qualified to give an opinion on such a subject, that the reduction of 2d. which meant a third of the tax of 6d. in the £, would certainly be of great benefit to the poorer classes, especially in Ireland. If there was any difficulty in meeting the deficit which might be caused by a further reduction of 1d., it might be some argument against the proposal. The Chancellor of the Exchequer last year, speaking on the subject, said that personally he would be glad if he could reduce the duty by 2d. The intentions of the right hon. Gentleman had not been carried out, either last year or this. The time had come when, in all justice and fairness to those who did not benefit by the reduction of a 1d. last year, the right hon. Gentleman should, carrying out his own wish, and the pledges of a number of his supporters, consider the case of the poorer classes who lived in remote country places, who were not represented to the same extent as those who lived in crowded cities. In certain country districts tea was purchased from porters who went round once or twice a week. There was no competition in those districts such as was to be found between grocers in large towns, and the result was that the trifle taken off the tea duty, although it might benefit to some extent those who lived in large towns, was not felt in distant rural areas. The deficit which would be caused by a further reduction of the duty by 1d. could be met without disturbing the Budget in any way if some other tax were substituted. There were something like £150,000,000 worth of other taxable commodities, chiefly imported from foreign countries, which were not like tea, the latter being grown to a large extent within our own Empire, notably in Ceylon. These other commodities consisted of frozen meat, salt beef, tinned and preserved meats, bacon, ham, frozen pork, salt pork, and so forth, which came into this country without a penny of taxation. Where the unfortunate inequality arose was that in large cities and commercial and manufacturing centres those very commodities which he had mentioned were consumed in large quantities and were not used at all in country districts, so that they brought to one class of the community free food, while in country districts the people produced and lived upon their own beef and mutton and bacon and enjoyed none of the advantages of dwellers in towns, nor did they receive any benefit from the reduction which had been made on the tea duty last year. If the Chancellor the the Exchequer confined his Budget to the narrow basis on which he was working this year he thought poor people in country districts would receive little relief. Personally he had much pleasure in supporting the Amendment.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Gla gow, Camlachie) was understood to say that he supported the Amendment, though there were two reasons of a somewhat deterrent nature against his doing so. The first was that it was a matter of history that the only certified lunatic who ever voted in that House voted in favour of a reduction of the tea duty—a circumstance which should make it difficult for him to support the Amendment. The next reason was to be found in the speeches delivered from the Front Bench below him and by those around him. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that he could not make any further reduction of the tea duty, and that it would have very slight effect if made. The ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer had admitted that there were two or three particular circumstances which went to make up the retail price of an article. There was first the tax. If the reduction of the tax was not sufficient to bring about a fall in the retail price of the article on which the tax was placed, then, of course, the middleman made the profit. If the reduction of the tax was not large enough to effect a reduction of the price charged to the retailer, then there could not be at once a reduction to the consumer. The retail price would probably remain the same, and some other person benefited. But if they dealt with a charge on an article in the form of extra cost, or considered the cost of the article in the form of an extra tax, it was an addition which ultimately the consumer must pay. It had been contended that when a tax was put on an article a rise of price did not take place. That was true in regard to the corn tax, because corn became very plentiful at the time, but there was a rise at first. He was a member of a firm which landed 1,000 quarters of wheat on the quay at Liverpool, and when a 1s. duty was imposed, that corn immediately became 1s. dearer. He might tell the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London, who represented a great city composed mainly of commercial men, that had the price of corn in America been the same and 1s. was put on the price would have become 1s. dearer. Anything which added to the cost of an article, whether it was duty, freight, or scarcity, in the end must make that article dearer. As to the price of corn not falling when the duty was taken off they all knew that it was only a temporary and local interception, and to found an argument upon that fact was an absurdity. It had been said that the reduction of the tea duty by 1d. last year had not improved the quality to the consumer. The hon. Member who made that statement forgot that there was such a thing as competition.

Let a man in any trade endeavour to reduce the quality of an article in order to augment his profit, and although he might succeed for a week or a year —as the tariff reformers succeeded in deceiving certain Members of the Unionist Party for a period—competition would compel him to give the same value in the end as other grocers or otherwise he would be driven out of the trade.

Sir F. BANBURY said he was not afraid of being turned out because he was a tariff reformer.

Mr. ALEXANDER CROSS said he proposed to support the Amendment on the plea that there were a great many persons upon whom this tax told most severely. He thought it was the duty of any hon. Member who represented the toilers and moilers whose present burdens were greater than their wages could bear to urge the necessity of the reduction of a tax which pressed so severely upon them. He felt it his duty to use every available opportunity to press upon those in charge of the finances of the country the importance of never losing sight of the fact that this was a tax which pressed very severely upon the poor and that any alleviation would be welcome.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been rather inconsistent on this question. The right hon. Gentleman had said he objected to taking 1d. off the tea duty because it would make no difference to the consumer. He would like to know in that case why 1d. was taken off tea last year, it being then argued that it would make a very considerable difference That was not a very consistent attitude for the Government to adopt. He desired to support the appeal in favour of taking d. per pound off Colonial tea.

Mr. ASQUITH pointed out that 97 per cent. of the tea consumed in this country came from the Colonies.

Mr. ASHLEY said that was all the more reason for encouraging it by giving the Colonies a preference. He thought the present time was an opportune moment for the Government to endeavour to do something for the Colonies, for they would greatly appreciate even the smallest amount of preference. He hoped the Colonial Conference would not be allowed to break up without the Government giving some small concession to the Colonies in regard to the tea duty.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said he had been for twenty years a Member of the House of Commons and had taken part in a great many discussions of this character, but until last year and on the present occasion he had never heard of an Amendment to reduce the tea duty coming from the Conservative Party. Irish Members had frequently moved to reduce the tea duty, and so had Radicals below the gangway. He felt it his duty to point out that this Bidget was rather hard upon Ireland. The difficulty they always had to encounter in discussing these proposals was that the Budget was always drawn up—and it was inevitable that it should be so—with a view to the condition of this country. It was almost impossible for the Irish Members to get a hearing for their view as to the effect upon the Irish people of Budgets drawn up from an English point of view. It had now become almost an accepted axiom that the aim of the Chancellor of Exchequer should be to maintain the balance between direct and indirect taxation. It had become the custom of Chancellors of the Exchequer to boast that they had kept direct taxation a little above indirect, and it had been stated that the proportion was 52 per cent. of direct taxation and 48 per cent. of indirect taxation. He wished to point out that in Ireland the proportion was 75 per cent. of indirect and 25 per cent. of direct taxation. While the proportion in Great Britain of direct taxation to indirect taxation was increasing, in Ireland it was decreasing. That was a melancholy state of things and showed the great evil which might arise from the application of one principle to countries whose social and economic conditions were radically different. That was one of the evils which had led to the over taxation of Ireland, and it was one of the causes of the great poverty existing in that country. He had never alleged that English

Members had willingly and knowingly inflicted this great injustice upon Ireland. His opinion was that in many cases they did it unknowingly, because naturally their minds were fixed upon the social and economic condition of their own country. It was impossible to deny that the Budgets of this country were so constructed as to inflict a monstrously heavy burden upon the poor classes in Ireland. That was the reason why Irish Members had for the last twenty years, in season and out of season, resisted indirect taxes upon articles of food. Many years ago a Chancellor of the Exchequer twitted the Irish Party with having allowed two or three sessions to go by without questioning the injustice of the English system of taxation. It was for that reason that he could not allow this discussion to pass without some Irish Member taking part in it. He did not intend to raise the question of the over-taxation of Ireland in detail at the present moment. And why? Because they knew that on Tuesday next a great scheme would be proposed which would probably inflict a totally new system of taxation upon Ireland. At all events, they would reserve their comments until they saw what the present Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to do. He wished to say a word on an aspect of the case which appeared to him to have been lost sight of by hon. Members above the gangway who were supporting the Amendment and still more by the Members of the Labour Party with whom the Nationalist Party generally acted. While he felt bound in the interest of the Irish people to support this Amendment as he had always supported Amendments of a similar character, he, on the other hand, in justice to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, must say that if they in this country were going in for a system of universal old age pensions all classes would have to contribute to it. That was a consideration which appeared to have dropped out of sight. Putting aside for a moment the peculiar position of Ireland, and speaking as if he were an English Member, he was bound to say that the question of old age pensions was a very large one, and that it would involve an enormous expenditure. He thought there was a good deal to be said for the Chancellor of the Exchequer who in introducing the Budget had pointed out that his main motive—he took it that it was his only motive—for not proposing larger reductions of taxation was that he was laying by the resources necessary to commence a system of old age pensions. Looking at the proposal from the general point of view, his own attitude towards the whole question of taxation would be considerably modified if they accepted the principle of old age pensions and laid upon themselves the duty of providing the enormous annual income required therefor. Old age pensions would be so enormous a boon to the working classes that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be justified in asking for some larger contribution from indirect taxation, balanced, of course, by contributions from direct contributions, if any such scheme should be introduced. While he felt bound to support the Amendment he recognised that it was open to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to meet the Irish difficulty at another time, and he and his friends awaited with interest the proposals which he would make. There were two ways of meeting the Irish difficulty.

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think I must remind the hon. Member that I have allowed him a good deal of latitude on the Irish question. After all, this is the question of the tea duty and not of the general system of taxation and I must ask the hon. Member to confine himself to that question as it affects Ireland.

Mr. DILLON said he was just concluding. It had always been the custom to go into the Irish question on the tea duty. He was sorry to say that the tea duty was a very important Irish question, because it hit Ireland exceedingly unjustly. He was stating why the Nationalist Members were supporting the Amendment, and sparing the House a discussion which on former occasions had occupied the greater part of a night.

Sir EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe) said the hon. Member for East Mayo had spoken year after year of the iniquities of the duty on tea. He himself was rather inclined to agree with the hon. Member for the City of London in his disposition to vote with the Government against the proposed reduction, believing that the immemorial proportions as between direct and indirect taxation should be maintained. He asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to remember that 97½ per cent. of our tea came from India and Ceylon. Upwards of 2,000,000 of Indian natives in eking out a precarious existence were dependent on the cultivation of the plant. He could not but think that it was a most iniquitous proceeding to tax an article which came directly and almost exclusively from India and Ceylon, while we allowed foreign manufactures to come in free. After all, tea was partially a raw material. It had to go through a series of processes before it was fit for use. Personally, he was not going to take part in the division on the Amendment, although he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had hardly made out a case for not taking 2d. off the tea duty. The right hon. Gentleman placed himself on the horns of a dilemma when he said that a 1d. off the duty would not reach the ordinary consumer. That was the contention which tariff reformers had been making all over the country. They said that any import duty on an article in which there was a good deal of competition was bound to be borne by the middleman and the exporter. But if 1d. was insufficient, why did not the right hon. Gentleman take 2d. off? The right hon. Gentleman said he and his Party had the mandate of the country not to turn their faces to other sources of revenue. When the Opposition suggested that there were certain manufactured articles coming into this country on which a small duty might be levied, the right hon. Gentleman said the Government had the mandate of the country not to depart from the existing system of taxation. Whence did the Party opposite get their inspiration? What was the basis of their contentions as to this mandate? The House might know that there was an interesting animal called the ornithorhynchus, which had feet like a deer, claws like an owl, fur like a badger, a tail like a rat, and could swim like a fish. The mandates and attributes of the Government reminded him of that animal. They possessed many and various characteristics. The Government said they had mandates to uphold free trade, to reform the system of education, to deal with licences, and to introduce some form of devolution leading up to Home Rule for Ireland. If they had all these mandates, on what did they base their contention? At any rate he protested against the proposal to reduce the tea duty, and therefore he would refrain from opposing the Government.

SIR C. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.) agreed with the proposal to maintain the 1s. income-tax, but he thought in regard to the sugar and tea duties the Chancellor of the Exchequer might have done more. He had for many years voted in favour of the reduction of the tea tax. He was in favour of a free breakfast table as far as possible. The present seemed to him an occasion when, with a large surplus, it would have been quite possible for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to have relieved the poorer classes of the community in connection with the tea or sugar duty. In the last few months the price of the lower qualities of tea had risen 2d. or 3d. per pound, or 40 per cent. The fact that the price had so risen meant that a reduction in the duty would have been of advantage to the poorer classes. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that 1d. in the pound off the tea duty would not be felt. Members of the House were aware that in the poorer districts of large cities tea was not always sold in one pound packets. It was also sold in quarter-pound packets, and even in smaller quantities, and, therefore, a difference of 1d. per pound was immediately felt by the poorer classes. He sympathised very much with what had fallen from the hon. Member for East Mayo. There was no doubt that the Irish people consumed largely the high classes of tea, and it seemed rather hard that the one article they consumed in enormous quantities should be so heavily taxed. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer, before he brought in the Bill based on these Resolutions, would consider whether he could not make some reduction on the tea duty. He would follow the example of the hon. Baronet opposite and abstain from supporting in the division Lobby the Party with which he had generally the pleasure of voting.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend) said that the hon. Member for East Mayo had said that the Members on the Opposition side of the House had suddenly developed an objection to indirect taxation. He did not think that that conclusion was exactly in accordance with fact. They had no objection to indirect taxation; quite the contrary. What they objected to was that as the national expenditure was steadily increasing, the system of taxation was running in a vicious circle, and that if the Chancellor of the Exchequer was to give relief anywhere, he must do so within a very narrow radius or resort to the income-tax. No reduction of the taxation on tea or sugar could accomplish what the Chancellor of the Exchequer desired to meet, the increased national expenditure caused by an increase of population. The right hon. Gentleman, if he did not get his necessary income from sugar and tea, must obtain it from spirits, or a readjustment of the income-tax. The hon. Member for East Mayo opposed a tax on the very poor from a local standpoint. He said that 72 per cent. of the taxation imposed on Ireland was indirect, especially on tea and sugar. It was admitted that the tax on tea was very heavy, and that it pressed on the poor man to the extent of 100 per cent. of the value of the tea. No doubt that was unfair. An hon. Member had suggested that they on the Opposition side of the House had developed a concern for the poor man, the suggestion being that hitherto they had had no sympathy with the poorer classes. What they proposed was the introduction of a different system of taxation, by which there would be a reduction of the tea tax, which would give relief to the poor, and give an opportunity of raising revenue on certain imports. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was a very hard-headed and somewhat hard-fisted business man—he meant as Chancellor of the Exchequer—and he had suggested that the reduction of the tea duty by a penny, if it did not lead to a reduction in the price of the article, would lead to a betterment in in quality. Did anybody believe that if a poor man or woman went into a grocer's shop and insisted on getting a better quality of tea, he or she would be listened to? He did not think that any grocer would be so altruistic as to do that. The advantage would go to the middleman. An hon. Member had suggested that the element of competition ought to be taken into consideration; but did any one believe that the poorer class of people would go from shop to shop and carefully test the quality of the tea offered them. [Cries of "Yes" from the LABOUR Benches.] Then they had more time on their hands than was generally suggested by those who demanded an eight-hours day. His contention was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given an entirely wrong interpretation of the situation. The fact was that the right hon. Gentleman was faced with a dilemma. The right hon. Gentleman said that if he took a halfpenny off the sugar duty it would be of no benefit to the consumer. [MINISTERIAL cries of "A farthing."] Well, let it be a farthing or half-a-farthing. What he, and those who agreed with him, maintained was that if a duty of 1s. per cwt. were put on corn imported into this country, it would not fall on the consumer in the same proportion as a farthing per pound on tea. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was faced with the protests of his friends that a duty of 1s. per cwt. on corn would ruin the working man; but, in effect, the right hon. Gentleman had admitted that it would really make no difference. He had said that the reduction of 1d. per pound on the duty on tea had not been enjoyed by the consumer, because of temporary causes. He (Sir Gilbert Parker) did not believe that that explanation was satisfactory. He would support the Amendment, first, because he believed that the tax was too high; and secondly, because it was unequal in its incidence, and fell more heavily on the poor who paid 1s. or so per pound for their tea, than on the rich who paid from 2s. 6d. to 4s. 6d. and upwards per pound for their special tea. He also supported the Amendment because he wanted to broaden the basis of taxation so that it would not press heavily on the poor. At any rate, if a duty were put on foreign corn, a preference of some sort would be given to our great and important colonies, to whom it would be of incalculable assistance in the development of their resources. It would, moreover, ultimately cheapen the price of corn in this country. [An HON. MEMBER: Rubbish.] He protested against the discourtesy of the interruption when a great deal of latitude had been allowed to previous speakers. He wished to express the belief that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be compelled to reduce the taxes on tea and sugar by the pressure of his own Party.

*LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) said that the hon. Member for Gravesend had, in course of his interesting speech, spoken about the great advantage of broadening the basis of taxation. With all humility he wished to say that he would be very glad if any one could tell him what was meant by "broadening the basis of taxation." His impression was that, whoever paid a tax in the first instance, ultimately the tax would be spread over the whole body of the population. He was in the fortunate position of being able to take the course of following the lead of the hon. Member for the City of London and would support the Government. He objected to pay taxes himself, but after all the money had to be raised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer somewhere and somehow, and if it was not to be raised from the tea duty, it must be raised in some other direction—say, from the income-tax. They constantly heard comparisons made between direct and indirect taxation. The great merit attributed to direct taxation was that it brought home to the taxpayer any extravagance on the part of the Government of the day. But the direct taxpayers were a very small number compared with the indirect taxpayers, and they did not in fact exercise any very considerable political power. The great mass of power in this country lay in the hands of the working classes, who paid no income-tax. The result was they did not feel the effect of a rise in the income-tax.

*MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER said the noble Lord was going far too widely in this matter. He could not go into all these matters which he was now discussing without embarking on a discussion which was out of order.

LORD R. CECIL said it was a little difficult to explain why he objected to any remission of the tea duty without going into these matters. He would not, however, enlarge further. It was enough for him to say that inasmuch as the working classes paid tea duty as much as any other section of the community it followed that, as the mass of the power in this country lay in the hands of the people of the country, if the tea duty was raised they would feel it at once, and would at once use their power to stop the extravagance that necessitated it. He should, therefore, vote for the Government and against the Amendment.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central) said that had the Amendment been to remit 2d. instead of 1d. he would still have been inclined to support it. The reason for that was that the hon. Member for Nottingham last year, when a reduction of 1d. was being made, read a number of interesting documents showing that while the 1d. taken off would be transferred from one branch of the trade to another, there was no evidence that it would be transferred to the consumer, who would, therefore, obtain no benefit from the remission. If they derived no benefit from the remission last year how could it be said that they would derive a benefit from the remission now proposed. If 2d. had been remitted last year the consumer would have benefited, but to take off 2d. in two bites, as it were, destroyed the benefit they otherwise would receive. There had been some evidence of what the result would be of a remission of 2d. In a great many cases it was the practice of the tea dealers who sold quarter-pound packets of tea to put on those packets when the duty was raised that the price of those packets was increased by ½d. on account of a rise in the tea duty. If 2d. was taken off the same rivalry and competition would have necessitated the tea dealers putting on those packets, "The price of this packet is reduced by ½d.," and the consumer would immediately have got the benefit. As he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made a great mistake in not reducing the tax on tea by 2d. he should support the Amendment. Another reason for his taking that course was that, after he spoke on this subject last year when he strongly advocated a reduction of 2d., he received no end of letters from members of the trade alleging that no advantage would be derived by the consumer from the reduction of a penny. He desired the Chancellor of the Exchequer to bear in mind in dealing with taxes on food that the reduction of a tax should always be done in such a way that the consumer could force the trade to give them the benefit. Whenever a small reduction was made it was never transferred to the consumer. It should always be sufficiently large to make it worth the while of the middleman to reduce the price of the goods sold over the counter. While they were promised old age pensions next year nothing had been said to show that there would be no change in the duties upon tea and sugar, and he for his part hoped that a substantial reduction would be made in either one or the other or both next year.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) said he quite agreed that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made a great mistake in not reducing the tax upon tea by more than 1d. last year. He was inclined to vote for this Amendment because he thought as a result of the double reduction the consumer would benefit. He could not follow the hon. Member who had just sat down. According to the hon. Gentleman if the tax was reduced by 1d. even until it was taken off altogether the consumer would get no benefit. He quite agreed that when the right hon. Gentleman reduced the tax on tea or sugar he should reduce it by such an amount and in such a way that the whole of the benefit should go to the consumer. The right hon. Gentleman had lost a valuable source of revenue in the coal duty which he could have easily devoted to the reduction of the tea duty. The result of remitting that duty had been of advantage to foreign buyers, whilst it had been of the greatest disadvantage to the consumers in this country. The general taxpayers of the country had lost £2,500,000 a year, an amount which might not only have been devoted to the reduction of the tea duty, but also to forming a valuable nucleus for old age pensions. Because he agreed with his hon. friend in reducing this tax, and because he thought the proposed reduction of 1d. would benefit the consumer, he supported the Amendment.

*MR. F. E. SMITH (Liverpool, Walton) said it was seldom he disagreed with his noble friend the Member for East Marylebone, but on this occasion he could not accept or adopt the argument he had put forward that there was a great deal to be said in favour of retaining the tax in its present form because it was likely to bring home to the working classes a sense of their national responsibility. That was an argument that might equally be addressed either to an increase or a decrease in all indirect taxation. In his opinion indirect taxation upon tea and sugar pressed with undue and disproportionate harshness upon the poorest classes. He desired to make one or two observations on that, and to call attention to the guidance that had been given to us in this matter by the practice in other countries. We were the only English speaking race who imposed any taxation on tea, and if we had regard to foreign countries, in Germany the duty amounted to 1½d., in Sweden 3d. and in Denmark 4d. In this country, where we were inflexibly determined that there should be no taxes on food, we raised a revenue of £6,000,000 upon tea. He did not imagine that any change had taken place in the circumstances of the country during the last twelve months which would entitle anyone to say that the reduction of 1d. this year would not go to the consumer, but that last year it did. The question which he had asked of the right hon. Gentleman last year, and which the right hon. Gentleman necessarily considered before making this proposal, was whether the reduction of 1d. would really reach the consumer. The answer given by the right hon Gentleman was that it would. He asserted that all the arguments used in the House a year ago were applicable to-day. He believed that all hon. Gentlemen opposite eighteen months ago said they were against food taxes. There was not one who contested an election who would not remember the words on the posters, "No food taxes." He therefore trusted he would have the support of all hon. Members who announced eighteen months ago that they were in favour of no food taxes. There were very few who, having announced that they were opposed to all taxes on food, did not also announce themselves as being in favour of old age pensions, and therefore admitted that the two propositions were not mutually destructive. If their contention was an honest one, and if they had given attention to the financial circumstances of the country as a whole and were satisfied that it was a practical possibility to give old age pensions and take off these food taxes they should have no hesitation in joining with him in supporting the Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 250; Noes, 146. (Division List No. 152.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barker, John
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A, Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, Rt. Hn Sir J. T. (Chesh.
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Davies, W. Howell (Bristol, S.)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder Sir John P.
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall)
Elibank, Master of
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferguson, R. C. Munro
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.
Glendinning R. G.
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Kearley, Hudson E.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lambert, George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
M'Callum, John M.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)

Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Mond, A.
Montagu, E. S.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Phillip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
Partington, Oswald
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price,C.E.(Edinb'gh,(Central)
Price,RobertJohn(Norfolk,E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas(W.Monm'th
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson,Rt.Hn.E.(Dundee)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw.CharlesEdw.(Stafford)
Shaw,Rt.Hon.T.(Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor,TheodoreC.(Radcliffe)
Tennant,H.J.(Berwickshire)
Thomas,Abel(Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker,H. De R.(Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Waton,SirJohnL.(Leeds,S.)
Ward,John(Stoke upon Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley(Southampton
Waring, Walter
Wason,Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Whitbread, Howard
White,J.D.(Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley,JohnHenry(Halifax)
Whittaker,SirThomasPalmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
WilliamsLlewellyn(Carmarth'n
Wilson,J.H.(Middlesbrough)
Wilson,J.W.(Worcestersh.N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B.Stuart-
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham,William(Cork,N.E.)
Acland-Hood,Rt.Hn.SirAlex.F
Ambrose, Robert
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hn.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour RtHn.A.J(CityLond.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Baring,Capt.Hn.G(Winchester
Barrie,H.T.(Londonderry N.)
Barry, E. (Cork S.)
Beach,Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Becket, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Brotherton, Edward Allen
Burke, E. Haviland-
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish,Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil,Evelyn(Aston Manor)
Chamberlain,Rt.HnJ.A(Worc.
Clark,GeorgeSmith(Belfast,N.
Clough, William
Collings,Rt.Hn.J.(Birmingham
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,A.Cameron(Glasgow)
Corbett,T.L.(Down,North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CharlesCurtis(Antrim,S.)
Craig,CaptainJames(Down,E.)
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Alexander
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dillon, John
Dixon-Hartland.SirFredDixon
Donelan, Captain A.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in(Furness
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Faber, George Denison(York)
Faber,Capt.W.V.(Hants,W.)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Ernest(Berks,East)
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glover, Thomas
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashf'rd
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazelton, Richard
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F(BurySEdm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hudson, Walter
Hunt, Rowland
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kelly, George D.
Kennaway,RtHon.SirJohnH.
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lea,Hugh Cecil(St.Pancras E.)
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col.A.R.
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh,Jeremiah(Down,S.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.
Moore, William
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien,Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare,N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick

O'Malley, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Parker, James (Halifax)
Percy, Earl
Power, Patrick Joseph
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampt'n
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton under Lyne
Sheehy, David
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Snowden, P.
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Thomson, W. Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thorne, William
Thornton, Percy M.
Valentia, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Wardle, George J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Fletcher and Sir William Bull.

Resolution agreed to.

Second Resolution read a second time.

MR. HARMOOD-BANNER (Liverpool, Everton) moved to strike out the words "until Parliament otherwise determines," and to insert the words, "Until the first day of July, 1908." In previous years he had found that the Resolution invariably ran, "Until the first day of July in the year" succeeding that in which the Resolution was passed. This year, for some reason or another—and they had a right to an explanation—they found that the charge was made a permanent one, and this had been done without any notice, so far as he had been able to gather, having been given to the House or to the trades interested in either tobacco, beer, or spirits. He had no doubt they would hear why it was to be made a permanent tax. It was not mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman in his Budget speech, and as regarded tobacco he was certainly astonished to learn that it was now to become a permanent tax instead of being dealt with from year to year. The manufacture of tobacco was rather a prosperous business, and there was a feeling that these duties ought to be altered so that manufactured tobacco and raw tobacco were put on the same level. At present the duty on manufactured tobacco was comparatively so much higher than the duty on raw tobacco that no manufactured tobacco of any sort or kind came into this country. They who believed in no duty on raw material and a duty on manufactured articles were not able to understand how the Government could consistently levy these taxes as they were now doing. It had no doubt added enormously to the prosperity of manufacturers in Bristol and other places, and it was a distinct preference against the importation of manufactured articles from other places. No doubt, when they advocated their principle of tariff reform they would bring up the fact of the prosperity of this industry, which showed dividends of twenty or thirty per cent. They would be able to illustrate their case by reference to the manufactured tobacco industry, and if the House did not accept the views of tariff reformers, at all events they should accept their own views and put raw tobacco and manufactured tobacco on an equality, so that there should be no preference or difference between them. He wanted to know why the duty was to be made permanent instead of temporary, and why the excise duties on beer and spirits, raised for war purposes, were to be for all time, instead of for the year, when they could be brought up for discussion again another year. He certainly felt called upon to express his surprise that the Resolution was in this form, instead of being annual—a plan which would enable those interested in the trades affected to have questions properly analysed and discussed, so that they might know where they were. He begged to move.

SIR F. BANBURY, in seconding the Amendment, said the object of his hon. friend was to preserve the opportunity which had existed for the last thirty or forty years, probably longer, in that House, of discussing Resolutions with reference to these particular taxes. These taxes had been raised to the height at which they stood at the present moment because it was necessary to provide funds to carry on the war. They were war taxes, yet not a single farthing had been reduced since the war. It had always been hoped that when the finances of the country permitted, the taxes which were raised during the war would be reduced, if not to their former level, at any rate to a lower limit than that at which they now stood. The only reason that he could see why the Chancellor of the Exchequer sought to make these taxes permanent was either that he saw no hope that the revenue would increase —which did not bear out the statements which he had made in introducing the Budget—or else that he was determined that under no circumstances should these taxes ever be reduced, and therefore made them permanent in the hope that they would be lost sight of by the people who were paying them, and by Members of the House. He could see no reason why this course should be taken. If the taxes in their present form were just, if they were necessary to meet the requirements of the country, why should not the House of Commons have an opportunity of considering them on the Resolutions as it had done from time immemorial? He had little doubt that a great number of Chancellors of the Exchequer would like to have done this had they dared, but he did not believe his right hon. friend below him would have dared, because he would at once have been met by such a protest from the other side of the House. He had great pleasure in seconding the Amendment.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'Parliament otherwise determine,' and insert the words 'the first day of July, nineteen hundred and eight.'"—(*Mr. Harmood-Banner.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the said Resolution."

Mr. ASQUITH said the hon. Member opposite was perfectly entitled to raise this question, and he regretted that in compressing his speech, in consideration for the House, as much as he could, he omitted this particular point. No doubt he ought to have referred to it. But it was completely covered by the statement he made, that for the time being these war-taxes ought to be regarded as taxes of a permanent character. But the objection taken by the hon. baronet was a most extraordinary one. He seemed to think that there was something unconstitutional in having a tax for all time until Parliament otherwise interfered, and that the proper and normal course was to get taxation renewed annually by the Finance Act of the year. They could not have had a more remarkable illustration than the case now before them. These duties on tobacco, beer and spirits were small extra taxes which were imposed in the year 1900, and not from time immemorial. They were small additional duties put on for the purposes of the war, but the actual duties on beer, spirits and tobacco were permanent duties which never came under the review of Parliament. The right hon. Baronet seemed to think that they were committing a gross infraction of the Constitution in passing these heavy duties once for all, and because he made a change in assimilating these additions with the particular taxes to which they belonged and treating them as part of the general taxation.

Sir F. BANBURY said that was one of the great reasons why he objected, because these were duties which were imposed for the purposes of the war, and it was presumed that when the war was over they might be taken off. It was now proposed to make them permanent.

Mr. ASQUITH said that these small additional duties on beer, spirits, and tobacco, and on luxuries, were put on at the time of the war, and he did not think that they ought to be exposed to the necessity of every year renewing them for another year, which they did not do in the case of normal taxation, with two exceptions—the tea duty, on which there was a Resolution to enable the House to review the whole of the indirect taxation, and the income-tax Resolution, to enable the House to review the whole of our direct taxation. His proposition was that these small additions to the taxes should take their place as part of the permanent taxation. By taking that course they saved two clauses in the Finance Bill every year. He felt sure that his right hon. predecessor had been subjected to the same temptation as he had been, but that was the advantage, provided that no question of principle was involved. He was sure the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer would have been very glad to have saved these two clauses, but he would certainly have been exposed to a good deal of opposition and a good deal of criticism from some of his supporters if he had selected these two taxes.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the Chancellor of the Exchequer had correctly stated the constitutional position. It was necessary that the House should keep a sufficient control, and an annual control, over the taxation of the country, but all that had been required was that enough should be retained under the annual purview to make that annual purview effective. He had expressed his opinion upon this point when he was Financial Secretary to the Treasury, and his view was that that object was sufficiently secured by retaining the tea duty and income-tax as subjects for annual review. It was quite true that the change which the right hon. Gentleman now proposed indicated a confession, or a decision, on his part which had not been avowed by his predecessors. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that he intended these duties and the sugar duty to be permanent, and they were to be enacted once for all without being brought under annual review by the House. The right hon. Gentleman had now stated that he saw no chance of giving any relief from these taxes. It did not necessarily follow that hon. Members need take the same view. As one who had been Chancellor of the Exchequer, and who had experienced the temptation to which the right hon. Gentleman had succumbed, he did not think his present attitude was unreasonable. He had himself expressed a desire for the simplification of their financial procedure, and he did not oppose the alteration which was now being made. He had been Chancellor of the Exchequer for two years when the Budget was treated in a most contentious spirit by the then Opposition, and every opportunity was taken to raise discussions in order to delay progress and extend the length of time occupied by his proposals. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had carried out certain small alterations which he would have been glad to have adopted, but he was prevented from doing so on account of the character of the opposition offered to his proposals. He was glad the Party opposite were now having greater regard for common sense, and were apparently willing to unsay what they said with so much vehemence only a couple of years ago.

Mr. RAWLINSON said the right hon. Gentleman did not seem to appreciate the importance of the Amendment. In the year 1900 a special and extra tax was put on particular branches of industry, including the tobacco trade, and the spirit duties were also increased. Those engaged in the tobacco trade were prepared to put up with that extra burden as an emergency tax, simply because it was a temporary tax which would come before Parliament year by year. In that way those who objected to it were afforded an opportunity to oppose. He did not, however, intend to raise any objection to this form of taxation being continued, as he quite appreciated the argument which had been used by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. That, however, was not the point of the Amendment. The objection now taken was that they were making this tax into a permanent one instead of its remaining to be considered from year to year. Next year they might have no opportunity of discussing this proposal, or at any rate they would not have the same opportunity. He was aware that it could be raised upon a new clause, but that would be a hopeless way of discussing it. He thought this was a very important point, and the back benches on both sides of the House particularly ought carefully to consider the Amendment as being one which should commend itself to the common sense of the House generally.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping) protested against the assumption that this tax should be made permanent. It should not be overlooked that a particular trade was being severely and heavily penalised by the extra duty placed upon it for war purposes and for war purposes only. At the present time the tax was operating to the detriment of that trade, and it was proposed to continue the tax without further reference to the House each year. The question had been argued by the trade concerned, and their views had been several times placed before the present Chancellor of the Exchequer. The trade affected thought the present sugar tax pressed very unfairly upon them and upon those who held shares in the companies engaged in the trade. It had been shown that this trade already bore more than its fair share of the burden of taxation. He did not think the

Amendment had been fully understood. The words now suggested were "until Parliament shall otherwise determine," and the reason the Amendment was brought forward was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer wished to make this tax a permanent charge. He thought there was good reason for the proposition which had been made, and he would certainly support the Amendment

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS said he agreed with the view that this Resolution would undoubtedly have the effect of removing certain duties from the purview of the House. It was for the House to determine whether that was a wise proceeding or not. It might be most desirable from the Chancellor of the Exchequer's point of view that discussion should be limited, but that was not the opinion of the constituencies which sent Members to the House. They were sent there to control the financial business of the country, and if they passed this Resolution, they would put away from their yearly control certain important matters in connection with taxation. When hon. Members opposite were in Opposition they maintained that such questions should be argued as frequently as required. The position remained the same to-day.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not addressing himself to the question before the House.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS said he was endeavouring to show that indirect taxation such as the tea duty should not be removed from the purview of the House. In view of the extreme importance of the matter he asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer to reconsider its bearings. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman had a hard heart and a face of flint in this matter, but he would some day be in Opposition, when he would desire to review the Budget proposals of other Governments. Was it wise by passing this Resolution to shut the door and prevent the opportunity of criticising on all occasions the financial proposals which might come from Governments in the future? They had been threatened with the possibility of tariff duties enacted in the shape of Budget proposals. Were they to be told that these duties were to be relegated into an Act and so removed from the purview and discussion of the House? He appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to yield to those considerations which were urged in a public interest.

MR. ASQUITH said the hon. Member had largely exaggerated the dimensions of the question. There was no question and no possibility of removing the discussion of these things from the purview of the House by making the change now proposed. Next year the hon. Member would be able to discuss these matters first on the general discussion on the Budget Resolutions when everything was in order. He would not be able, it was true, to discuss them on Report, but he would be able to discuss them on the Second Reading, a third time when moving a clause in Committee, a fourth time on Report, and a fifth time on the Third Reading. He would have five distinct opportunities for discussing such matters, even after this revolutionary change had taken place. [AN HON. MEMBER: Procedure.] He was assuming that things remained as they were. He was more conservative than his hon. friend who interrupted. His hon. friend would have full opportunity of discussing the tariff duties which bulked so largely in his imagination.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said he fully accepted the right hon. Gentleman's assurance that they would be able to discuss all these matters four or five times, supposing that the Government did not bring in a new set of Rules. But it still remained true that even under that assumption they would be discussing these particular taxes as part of the permanent taxes of the country, or what the Chancellor of the Exchequer called the taxes existing for the time being. Under the existing state of affairs they could say, and in his opinion they ought to say, that these were additional taxes put on because of the war and were of an exceptional character because they were war taxes. But if the Amendment was not carried they might next year discuss these taxes four or five times, not as exceptional but as part of the permanent taxation. The case of himself and his friends was that taxes which might be quite appropriate in order to defray the charges of a war were not obviously the best taxes to be continued in time of peace. The Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day said that they must not only consider the taxes imposed in the duration of war, but also in the years that elapsed afterwards, during which they were paying off war debt. The right hon. Gentleman did not seem to have the courage of that opinion. According to his argument they ought to pay a 2s. income-tax. The war taxes had always been chosen in order to bring home to the people of the country the huge responsibility which they incurred when they went to war. They had been exceptional in their character and they ought not to be made permanent. They ought not to be told that they were as proper in time of peace as, he admitted, they were proper in time of war.

Mr. LEIF JONES (Westmoreland, Appleby) said he differed from the view expressed by hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House. He could not imagine more appropriate taxes than those on spirits and tobacco, and he congratulated the Chancellor of the Exchequer on having made these war taxes a permanent part of the system of taxation. He looked to the right hon. Gentleman to say that the duties on drink, even at the present time, had not reached their normal proportion as compared with the period before the war. The amount raised from taxation of drink before the war was 28 per cent of the expenditure of the country.

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question before the House is whether this tax should be made a permanent part of our taxation or be renewed every year.

Mr. LEIF JONES said he would leave that point. The point he specially wished to make was that there was still £150,000,000 of war debt unpaid, and so long as that remained it seemed to him that these taxes were properly part of taxation. If they were rightly put on at the time of the war, the position now required that they should be continued until the debt was paid off. Seeing that the taxes brought in £2,000,000 a year, about seventy-five years hence would be the time for their successors to consider the question of taking them off.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said the Chancellor of the Exchequer began his explanation with a bull. He said the tax was put on permanently for the time being. If he might reply with an Irish bull, he would say that he entirely agreed with the mover of the Amendment, that instead of the tax being permanent for the time being, it ought to be temporary for all time. He agreed with the hon. Member for the Camlachie division that the reason for this change on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was that it was part of the larger policy of muzzling the House of Commons, stifling discussion in the House, absolutely ignoring, wherever possible, the will of the House, except when dictated by Nationalists or Labour Members. He appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to remember that Irish Members had now a special interest in the question of tobacco. Only two days ago the Member for East Clare had introduced an Irish Tobacco Bill. He had the pleasure the other day of smoking an Irish cigarette given to him by the hon. Member, from which he suffered no evil effect. And indeed it had so soothing an influence on him that he could not help feeling that Irish grown tobacco might have far reaching political results. He would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to remember that this tobacco question might be—

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is not a proper matter for discussion now. This is a customs duty, not an excise duty.

Mr. T. L. CORBETT said he was going to appeal to the Chancellor of the Exchequer not to make permanent a tax which might affect Irish tobacco in future.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said that they all knew, unfortunately, what had happened to the income-tax. It had been increased from 8d. to 1s. 2d., and was now at 1s., although many of them had been hoping that it would have been still further reduced this year. What had happened in regard to the income-tax would happen to the particular tax the House was now discussing if the Amendment of his hon. friend was not carried. They all knew that if an appearance of permanency was given to a tax it was difficult to reduce it afterwards. He joined most heartily in the appeal of his hon. friend that this tax should not be made permanent. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that the House had five distinct opportunities of discussing these taxes; but he did not see that it would make much difference if the House was allowed to discuss them a sixth time.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he would be good enough, when framing his next year's Budget, to bear in mind the promise which the Secretary to the Treasury gave to the Standing Committee on the Irish Tobacco Bill, that arrangements would be made for dealing with the future growth of tobacco in Ireland, so as to make that measure operative.

*Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER having stated that the question of Irish tobacco was a matter of excise and not germane to this resolution,

Mr. ASQUITH said that the hon. Gentleman might be quite sure that he would not forget the assurances given by his hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND said that that met his point, and he was much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 257; Noes, 122. (Division List No. 153.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Boulton, A. C. F.
Brace, William
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner Rt. Hn. Sir. J. T. (Chesh.
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall)
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gill, A. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Griffith, Ellis J.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)

Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. PancrasE.)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall (Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Mason, A. E. W. (Coventry)
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)

Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh Central)
Price, Robert John (Norfolk, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Scott, A. H. (Ashton-under-Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)

Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, John W. (Durham)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke-upon-Trent)
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork N.E.)
Acland-Hood Rt. Hn. Sir Alex F.
Ambrose, Robert
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher. Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G. (Winchester
Barnard, E. B.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)

Clark, George Smith (Belfast, N.
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Captain James (Down, E.)
Crean, Eugene
Cross, Alexander
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dillon, John
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Donelan, Captain A.
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duffy, William J.
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East
Ginnell, L.
Haddock, George R.
Halpin, J.

Hamilton, Marquess of
Hayden, John Patrick
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hogan, Michael
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Joyce, Michael
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lundon, W.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Calmont, Colonel James
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Meagher, Michael
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Mooney, J. J.

Murphy, John
Nolan, Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, Sir Gilbert (Gravesend)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Ratcliff, Major R. F.
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Reddy, M.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheehy, David
Smith, F. E. (Liverpool, Walton)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thorne, William
Valentia, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walker, Col. W. H. (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Young, Samuel
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Harmood-Banner and Colonel Lockwood.

Resolution agreed to.

Third Resolution read a second time.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS moved that the words "until Parliament otherwise determine" be omitted in order to insert "until the 4th of July." He said his object was to draw the attention of the House to the peculiarity of the duty on spirit. The same charge was levied per gallon upon new spirit as upon old, and the amount of the duty depended upon the amount of alcohol present in the spirit per gallon. There was a considerable difference, which was acknowledged, in the spirit, some being fiery and some not. He was quite aware of the medical point of view about mild and matured spirit, but of course the Chancellor of the Exchequer wanted to get all the funds he could from this tax upon whiskey, although, inconsistently enough, the House of Commons was in favour of the reduction of the evils of intoxication.

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER ruled the hon. Member out of order on the ground that his remarks did not come within the purview of the Resolution.

Resolution agreed to.

Fourth Resolution read a second time.

SIR F. BANBURY called attention to the question of the stamp duty upon hire purchase agreements. No doubt the system was capable of many abuses. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself had said that these agreements led to a great many abuses.

MR. ASQUITH said the point was a technical one. The truth was that these hire purchase agreements in regard to chattels took various forms, and the question of what stamp they should bear had given rise to great diversity of opinion on that practice. There were three possible categories into which they might fall. The first was that of an agreement relating to the sale of goods, which was exempt from the stamp duty altogether. In the second place, the duty might be treated and had been treated as that upon a deed or covenant, under which it was liable to a high rate of duty; and then it might be treated as an ordinary agreement, which was liable to a sixpenny stamp. What the Government proposed was to establish uniformity of practice, and to have one uniform sixpenny stamp.

MR. RAWLINSON said that he understood that under this amendment of the law a hire purchase agreement up to £500 was to be treated as an ordinary agreement.

MR. ASQUITH: That is so.

MR. RAWLINSON said that in that case he had no objection, as he understood that there was to be no attempt to overrule the law, and no *ad valorem* duty.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness) inquired if the change would have any effect upon the revenue.

MR. ASQUITH: I cannot say whether it will or will not. It may have, but at any rate it will be very slight.

Resolution agreed to.

Fifth Resolution read a second time

*MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) asked for some explanation.

MR. ASQUITH thought it would perhaps save time if he volunteered an explanation as far as he was able to give it. The Question arose under Section 21 of the Finance Act of 1896, and in order to understand the situation created by that section, he would remind the House that before Sir William Harcourt's Finance Act of 1894, Mr. Goschen, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, by the Finance Act of 1888 increased the succession duties by certain percentages. In 1889, the right hon. Gentleman went a step farther and proposed a further estate duty, the object of which was subsequently carried out by the Act of 1894. These proposals were carried out effectively by the Act of 1894, but the Act of 1896 made them permanent, and prevented overlapping of the two sets of duties. It provided that Goschen's enhancement should not be levied in addition to the Harcourt enhancement. The whole object was that the value should be taken at the present value of the estate.

*MR. COURTHOPE thanked the right hon. Gentleman for his explanation, which, however, did not cover the point that he wished to raise. So far as he could gather from reading the Act of 1896, the result was that where a man had died setting up a trust by his will, the duty which was paid or payable on his death on the amount of his property which was the subject of that trust was to be deducted from the amount which was paid on the death of the *cestui que* trust.

MR. ASQUITH said that must be so, because that applied to deaths which took place prior to 1904.

*MR. COURTHOPE said he took it that under the Finance Act of 1896 the amount deducted was the actual sum paid or payable on the death of the testator. The proposal now before the House would, however, do away with that, and would enact that the amount deducted should be the amount that would have been paid or payable if the assessment had taken place at the time of the second death and not at the time of the first.

MR. ASQUITH: At the time when the estate duty becomes payable—yes.

*MR. COURTHOPE asked whether that might not lead to great hardships.

MR. ASQUITH said it might in some cases, but on the balance of cases he did not think it would. Where one man would lose another man would gain, and it was an advantage to have a fixed date. In this case there would be the very great advantage of knowing exactly what was the date.

*MR. COURTHOPE said the right hon. Gentleman would admit that there was no doubt as to the amount which was paid or payable on the death of the testator, but now quite a different sum might be deducted on the death of the *cestui que* trust. In some cases that would lead to great injustice, and he hardly thought it was possible to justify one person receiving less than he ought, or, to put it the other way, paying more than he ought because another man paid less than he ought.

MR. ASQUITH pointed out that the capital value in respect to which they had to make a deduction was a capital value which need not have been valued at the death of the testator, and was therefore speculative. The duty was therefore speculative. They would now know definitely what duty was payable.

*MR. COURTHOPE said that the amount was not hypothetical, because it was the amount either paid or payable. It must therefore have been assessed at the time of the first death. He still failed to appreciate the right hon. Gentlemen's contention, but the matter was really so technical that he would not discuss it further with him to-day.

MR. ASQUITH: We will discuss it again in Committee.

Resolution agreed to.

Sixth Resolution read a second time.

SIR F. BANBURY moved to omit the words "for the current financial year." It was this permanent annual charge that constituted the new sinking fund, and it was fixed with the object of using the balance that remained after paying the interest on the permanent charge for the reduction of the National Debt. It was fixed at a permanent sum in order that any Chancellor of the Exchequer should not be tempted to take away from that amount in times of prosperity anything which might properly go to the reduction of debt. It was true that the amount was changed at the South African War and that a portion of that which ought to have been devoted to the reduction of debt was used for the purposes of the war. But as soon as the war was over the amount was again altered, and the permanent debt charge of £28,000,000 was reinstated. The Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to increase the charge by £1,500,000. But the advantage of this increase would be lost unless the words to which he had drawn attention were left out, because unless those words were omitted the Resolution did not make the permanent charge for the service of the Debt £29,500,000; it only made the amount £29,500,000 for this year, and next year they might go back to £28,000,000. That was not the desire of the bulk of the Party opposite. Their object had always been that the permanent burden of debt should be reduced. The right hon. Gentleman himself had said that the war had added £138,000,000 to the Debt, and that that ought to be reduced as soon as possible; and one hon. Gentleman opposite had said that even if taxes had to be imposed for seventy-five years they ought to be imposed until the Debt was reduced. To a certain extent he agreed. He did not contend that they should lay down a hard and fast rule that till that £138,000,000 was paid they should not reduce the sum put aside for the reduction of permanent Debt, but he did say that in times of prosperity the sum put aside might reasonably be increased. The right hon. Gentleman had increased it by £1,500,000, and when that was first known in the city there was a natural feeling that it was going to do something towards the reduction of Debt. But when it was found it was only for a year it became apparent that it was not really an increase that would have any effect on the reduction of debt during the next five or six years. He claimed the support of all hon. Gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House who had pledged themselves to take steps to rehabilitate the credit of the country. He begged to move.

CAPTAIN CRAIG said he seconded the Amendment for the reason that on the face of the Resolution it appeared to be a permanent annual charge, and to have a "permanent annual charge" for only one year appeared to him to be an anomaly. He objected as strongly as his hon. friend below him to turning this permanent charge into an annual one, because there was no meaning in having a sinking fund of such gigantic magnitude to reduce the indebtedness of the nation if they were called upon to consider whether it should be added to by half a million or a quarter of a million, as the case might be, thus leaving them perpetually in doubt what the permanent annual charge for the Debt was to be. The country should know what the financial ideas of the Treasury really were at all times while the Government was in power; and he thought the House would appreciate very much the right hon. Gentleman's giving an explanation of what was intended on this particular occasion, because this £1,500,000 might be added this year only, and next year be taken away for some other purpose. The right hon. Gentleman should enlighten them as to his reason for putting in the words "for the current financial year." Did it mean that he had ear-marked this £1,500,000 for some definite purpose next year? The House would be very grateful if he would make some statement as to whether the sum was to be the foundation of a scheme of old-age pensions. It would be a very small foundation. Instead of having to open and reopen this question annually, the Government should make a definite statement of what their intentions were, and in that way relieve any anxiety the House and the country might feel concerning the chopping and changing which he was sorry this suggestion was going to introduce into the permanent annual charges of the country. There was no sounder basis for finance than a settled policy. If this was to be a settled policy, he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would have no objection to accepting his hon. friend's Amendment; if it was not to be a settled policy, at all events the right hon. Gentleman would be able to throw some light on what appeared to be a not very satisfactory innovation.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the words 'for the current financial year'"—(*Sir F. Banbury.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the said Resolution."

MR. ASQUITH said the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had not done him the honour to listen to or read his Budget speech, which gave explicitly the whole of the information for which he now asked.

CAPTAIN CRAIG said he had read every word of the speech, but he did not think this point had been made as clear as it might have been.

MR. ASQUITH said that at any rate what he stated then and what he stated now was that this £1,500,000 was to be used for the purpose of the new sinking fund, and he explained the ground on which he asked the House to assent to that course, and he also explained what his intentions were with regard to it. The phraseology of this particular clause was, he confessed, open to a certain amount of criticism on the ground of grammar, or at any rate of style. "Permanent annual charge for the current year," seemed rather an incongruous juxtaposition of phrases. The words "permanent annual charge" were taken from the Act of 1875, and the phrase had been used ever since the Customs Acts and Revenue Acts to describe in a compendious way the sum that in any year was set aside for the purposes of interest, management, and new sinking fund. It meant that the sum referred to in the Act of 1875 should, from this year, be the sum of £1,500,000. He hoped that, with this explanation, it would be seen that, having regard to the Act, he could not put it in a different form.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 291; Noes, 57. (Division List No. 154.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barran, Rowland Hirst
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R.
Benn, Sir J. Williams (Devonp'rt
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Brace, William
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Sir Wm. J (S. Pancras, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett, C H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Craig, HerbertJ.(Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Crossley, William J.
Davies, David(MontgomeryCo.
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Edwards, Clement (Denbigh)
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan(Hereford, S.
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, RtHn. HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harwood, George
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holt, Richard Durning
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman(Somers'tN.
Horridge, Thomas Gardner
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Jackson, R. S.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, John (Gateshead)
Jones, Leif (Appleby)
Jones, William(Carnarvonshire
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kelley, George D.
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, EdmundG.(Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, HughCecil(St. Pancras, E.
Lever, A. Levy(Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M(FalkirkBg'hs
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacVeagh, Jeremiah(Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles(Donegal, E.
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Micking, Major G.
Mallet, Charles E.
Mansfield, H. Rendall(Lincoln)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Montagu, E. S.
Montgomery, H. G.
Mooney, J. J.
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morse, L. L.
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murphy, John
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholls, George
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Kendal(TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Perks, Robert William
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pirie, Duncan V.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E.(Edinb'gh, Central)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Reddy, M.
Redmond, JohnE.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thomas(W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Rutherford, V. H.(Brentford)
Samuel, HerbertL.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M.(Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, C. Duncan (Hyde)
Scott, A. H.(Ashton underLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shackleton, David James
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Snowden, P.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Stuart, James (Sunderland)
Taylor John W. (Durham)
Taylor, TheodoreC.(Radcliffe)
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel(Carmarthen, E.)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson J. W. H(Somerset, E
Thorne, William
Tillett, Louis John
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Ure, Alexander
Vivian, Henry
Walsh, Stephen
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John(Stoke upon Trent)
Ward, W. Dudley(Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway

Whitbread, Howard
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth'n
Wilson, J. H. (Middlesbrough)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt Hn. J. A. (Worc.
Clark, George Smith (Belfast, N.)
Collings, Rt. Hn. J. (Birmingh'm
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, Charles Curtis (Antrim S.
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Forster, Henry William
Gardner, Ernest (Berks, East)
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich
Lockwood, Rt Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lowe, Sir Francis William
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Moore, William
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Valentia, Viscount
Walker, Col. W. H (Lancashire)
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Frederick Banbury and Captain Craig.

MR. ASQUITH suggested that at 8.15 they should suspend further proceedings on the Budget Resolutions as far as to-night was concerned, on the understanding that they should take them as the first Order next Wednesday, when he hoped that an hour—he meant a reasonably elastic hour—would be sufficient to dispose of them. The Government proposed to adopt that course. He included, of course, the local taxation Resolution.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the Opposition would be glad to accept his proposal. He wished to point out, however, that the local taxation Resolution was not put down for to-night, and it was not, therefore, part of the business that could have been proceeded with after eleven o'clock. Although he did not think that proposal would require any prolonged discussion, he knew that one or two hon. Members desired to elicit some further information. He hoped, therefore, that local taxation would not be included within the elastic hour.

MR. ASQUITH said the local taxation Resolution was so generally accepted that there would be no disposition to discuss it at length at this stage. They would, of course, be able to discuss it in the Bill. He would, however, put it down for Wednesday and allow another half hour.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the right hon. Gentleman had met them in a friendly spirit and he would do his best to co-operate with him in that respect.

Resolution agreed to.

Seventh Resolution agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS [24TH APRIL] REPORT.

Resolutions reported:

INCOME TAX.

1. "That income-tax shall be charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, at the rate of one shilling in the pound."

ESTATE DUTY.

2. "That in the case of persons dying on or after the nineteenth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, the rates of estate duty under section seventeen of The Finance Act, 1894, be amended so that—

Where the Principal Value of the Estate		Estate Duty shall be payable at the rate per cent. of	Instead of
Exceeds— £	£		
150,000 and does not exceed	250,000	Seven pounds - - -	Six pounds ten shillings
250,000 ,, ,,	500,000	Eight pounds - - -	Seven pounds
500,000 ,, ,,	750,000	Nine pounds - - -	Seven pounds ten shillings
750,000 ,, ,,	1,000,000	Ten pounds - - -	Seven pounds ten shillings.
1,000,000 ,, ,,	1,500,000	Ten pounds on one million and eleven pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
1,500,000 ,, ,,	2,000,000	Ten pounds on one million and twelve pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
2,000,000 ,, ,,	2,500,000	Ten pounds on one million and thirteen pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
2,500,000 ,, ,,	3,000,000	Ten pounds on one million and fourteen pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds
3,000,000 - - - - - -		Ten pounds on one million and fifteen pounds on the remainder	Eight pounds

INCOME TAX (INCLUSION OF ALL OFFICES AND EMPLOYMENTS IN SCHEDULE E).

3. "That the income tax charged on offices or employments of profit, whether public or not, be charged under Schedule E. in the The Income Tax Act, 1853."

INCOME TAX (LIMITATION ON THE AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF DEDUCTIONS OR REPAYMENTS FOR WEAR AND TEAR).

4. "That no deduction or repayment be allowed in any year in respect of the diminished value, by reason of wear and tear, of any machinery or plant which, when added to the deductions or repayments allowed on that account in previous years, will make the aggregate amount of the deductions or repayments exceed the actual cost of the machinery or plant."

INCOME TAX (ABOLITION OF REPAYMENTS IN RESPECT OF ASSESSMENT ON AVERAGE INCOME).

5. "That any abatement, relief, or repayment of income tax under section one hundred and thirty-three of The Income Tax Act, 1842, as amended by section six of The Revenue Act, 1865, shall cease."

INCOME-TAX (ASSESSMENT ON TRADES, ETC., RECENTLY COMMENCED).

6. "That income-tax charged under Schedule D in the Income-Tax Act, 1853,

on professions, trades, or vocations shall, in the case of professions, trades, or vocations which have been set up or commenced within the three years on which the average income is to be computed under the Income-Tax Acts or within the year of assessment, be charged with reference to the actual profits or gains arising in the year of assessment."

First Resolution read a second time:—

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS (Sheffield, Ecclesall) moved to omit the words "one shilling" and insert "elevenpence." In support of this Amendment he relied upon the statement of former Chancellors of the Exchequer who had promised that the income-tax payer ought to be the first to be relieved. What had happened? To meet the expenditure upon the war the income-tax was raised to a very large amount. When the war commenced it stood at 8d. It was then raised to 1s., then to 1s. 2d., and afterwards to 1s. 3d. In 1903 it was lowered to 11d., but when the corn duty was taken off in 1904 the income-tax was again raised to 1s., at which figure it now remained. The war taxes had been taken off tea, corn, coal, and partly off tobacco, but the income-taxpayer had received no relief at all. In introducing the Budget last year, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that an income tax at the uniform rate of 1s. in the pound at a time of peace was impossible to justify. Surely when the right hon. Gentleman made that speech he meant a general reduction of the tax, and he had not the subject of differentiation or graduation in his mind. Clearly his meaning was that the tax was too high all round. His proposal was that relief to the extent of one 1d. in the pound should be given to the income-tax payer. He did not quarrel with differentiation, but the tax ought to be reduced all round this year, and then the right hon. Gentleman might bring in a scheme for differentiation next year. Those who sat in Opposition desired to impress strongly upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the time had arrived when he must find new sources of revenue, and they were anxious to bring grist to the Chancellor of the Exchequer's mill by taxing foreign manufactured articles. [Cheers from the LABOUR BENCHES.] He welcomed those cheers, and he ventured to say that when the question of tariff reform was again raised the demand for it would come from the working classes. What they required was a small tax of 5 per cent. on manufactured goods——

*THE DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not in order in discussing that subject.

MR. SAMUEL ROBERTS said that all the great authorities on taxation were against a high income-tax. They all knew that Mr. Gladstone favoured doing away with the income-tax altogether, and he brought it down to 3d. in 1873, and when the Conservative Government came into power they reduced it to 2d.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, Further Proceeding was postponed without Question put, pursuant to Standing Order No. 4.

FAILURE OF SHOP HOURS ACT.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, Clitheroe) rose to call attention to the failure of the Shop Hours Act, and to move—"That, in the opinion of this House, more drastic legislation with regard to the closing of shops and the hours of shop assistants is required." He said that this was not a new question for the House. It had been discussed time after time. Many Committees had sat on the subject, and many reports had been made, but they were in a more favourable position that night, because there had been an opportunity of testing some of the suggestions which had been made in years gone by. It was really to that phase of the subject he wished to direct attention, namely, the failure of the endeavour which had been made by the late Government to deal with this subject. Many Members opposed the proposals of the late Government at the time they were made, preferring the altogether different plan embodied in the Bill introduced by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean for many years back. The opposition to the right hon. Baronet's Bill had taken the form of a Bill in the name of Lord Avebury. Lord Avebury's ideas on this question had been put into operation by the late Government, but the Act had failed. His hon. friend the Member for the Newton Division of Lancashire, who had been a shop assistant, would tell the House more authoritatively than he could do how the Act had worked. The present Act was drawn in the optional form, its provisions being governed all through by the word "may." He and his friends thought the word "shall" should govern everything in regard to shop hours. It did not deal with the hours of the shop assistants; it dealt with the hours of closing, which was a far different thing. The Act provided that the local authority "may" do certain things when satisfied that a *prima facie* case had been made out by people desiring a closing order. First of all, a two-thirds majority had to be got in favour of a closing order. There was no distinction made between one who held fifty shops and one who held one small shop. They were all reckoned on a level. There was no compulsion on the local authority to apply for a closing order, even when there was a two-thirds majority in favour of it. Anyone who had knowledge of the working of the Factory Acts knew that such a provision would make them absolutely nugatory and of no benefit to the operatives. In regard to the hours of shop assistants, unless they had compulsory powers there was very little use in Parliament spending its time legislating on the subject. Lord Avebury prided himself on the fact that the Act did not apply to the hours of labour, for he found that his Lordship had stated that—

> "there was nothing in the Bill to prevent employees being kept at work after the door of the shop had been closed."

That was said for the purpose of prevailing on certain people to accept even the present Act. The fact that the Act had been in operation two years, and that the number of orders issued under it was very small, proved that something different from Lord Avebury's suggestions was wanted in regard to this matter. In asking for this, he thought they could claim the support of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In a speech delivered in the House when the present Act was under discussion the right hon. Gentleman expressed regret that the then Government had not framed its title and scope so as to make it possible to introduce Amendments in Committee to meet cases of common occurrence where shop assistants were employed either before the opening or after the closing of shops. The right hon. Gentleman further said that no measure would be really effective which did not give the power of compulsorily closing shops. The Bill was so framed that Amendments in that direction could not be moved. Such Amendments as were competent were moved, but with very little success, and the Bill passed practically in the form in which it was introduced, so far as its main provisions were concerned. The Bill of the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean set out that they desired a sixty hours week. Some people might say that was an impossibility. He had inquired as to the hours of assistants in the co-operative shops of Darwen whose business was chiefly with the working classes. All the arguments as to workmen or their wives not being able to make their purchases within certain hours applied quite as much to these shops as to others. He was informed that the hours were 56¼ per week. There were fourteen days allowed each year for holidays, in respect of which no deduction from wages was made. He thought that was an ideal condition which the private trader might try to aim at. If the co-operative shops could be carried on successfully and increasingly so with these hours, it was not too much to ask the House to sanction a Resolution which called for more drastic legislation on the subject. There had been many cases where the people concerned had asked the local authorities for closing orders under this Act and had not succeeded in obtaining them, although they had the two-thirds majority in favour of the applications. At Dover recently twenty-four out of twenty-eight hairdressers applied for an order, and the town council, which was the deciding authority, said that a *prima facie* case had not been made out. So far as he was aware a closing order had not been applied in that case up to the present time. To get a two-thirds majority to start with was a tremendous thing, but, having got that, it was too much that the applicants should have to face a recalcitrant town council. That was a power which should be done away with at once. He was glad that the Home Secretary had asserted himself with regard to applications for the revoking of orders. The borough of Southwark had asked the revocation of an order on the ground that there was a sufficient number of people against it.

The right hon. Gentleman said that was not sufficient for him; he wanted proof of the opinion of the people. The result was that the answer given by the right hon. Gentleman was sufficient to check the movement for revocation. The question of areas also required consideration. There were twenty-nine local authorities in London, and as the administrative area of each closely adjoined the boundaries of one or more of the others, it was difficult to apply the closing orders in such a manner as to avoid unequal treatment. A shopkeeper on one side of a street might come within the closing order applicable to the area in which his premises were situated, while another shopkeeper on the other side of the street was not required to close his shop because no order had been issued in regard to the area in which he carried on business. The area should be sufficiently wide to cover all the shops in that area. Attention was called to this matter when the Bill was passing through the House, but no steps were taken to avoid the difficulties which were predicted. That was a point which ought to be dealt with in any measure which the Home Secretary might bring forward on the question of shop hours. He would take another case, that of hairdressers, about whom more orders had been issued under the Act by local authorities than in regard to all the other trades put together. One order fixed the closing time for hairdressers at 9 p.m. on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, on Thursday at 10 p.m., Friday at 11 p.m. and on Saturday at five minutes to 12 o'clock. He supposed that was done on religious grounds. It was feared that if the assistants were permitted to work up to midnight they might have to labour for a minute or two on the Sabbath! He was told that the only town that had successful and satisfactory orders was Glasgow, where the hours of the shop assistants had been really reduced. In the case of forty-eight trades the closing hour on Saturday was ten o'clock, and on other nights in the week eight o'clock. It must also be remembered that the Act dealt only with closing time. Nothing was said about opening time, with the result that in many cases assistants who worked late had to begin early. He thought the Shop Assistants' Association had taken a sensible view of the situation, and had done what they could to make the working of the Act successful by sending circulars to and approaching town councils and tradesmen. But, on the whole, the result had been very disappointing. In view of the universal failure of the Act, the Shop Assistants' Association had approached the right hon. Member for the Forest of Dean, who had taken such a keen interest in this matter, and the Labour Party to bring pressure on the Government to deal with the question next session. It was not only the shop assistants who were dissatisfied, but traders interested in the early closing movement also demanded better legislation. The Shopkeepers' Association, which represented thousands of tradesmen, was strongly in favour of more drastic legislation. That demand was supported by the *Drapers' Journal*, which published a list of the towns where the Act had been an absolute failure, and another article pointing out the districts where the hours of the shop assistants were seventy hours per week, or more. The purpose of his Resolution was to draw the attention of the Home Secretary to this matter, with the view of receiving from him a satisfactory assurance that his Department had really realised that the present Act was inoperative. As he had said, the Act on the whole had proved disappointing. It must no longer be permissive. Less power must be given to the local authorities, and more power vested in the central authority. He begged to move.

MR. SEDDON (Lancashire, Newton) said that in seconding the Resolution he had no wish to make an attack on any persons who were responsible for the original Act. Had it been blessed with a less exalted origin he might have been tempted to describe it as conceived without knowledge and shapen with impossible intention. This question had been before the House for forty years, and had been discussed by six Commissions and seven Committees of Inquiry. The Labour Party were deeply indebted to the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean for his persistent attempts to improve the position of shop assistants. It was said by the late Lord Salisbury that—

> "This is one of the cases in which the two Houses of Parliament occupy a somewhat difficult position. They are asked to legislate

> as to matters affecting the personal happiness and well-being of a very large number of persons—a very large class—to which, with scarcely any exception, the Members of the two Houses do not themselves belong. It is, therefore, very difficult for them to know how such a measure would affect the comfort of the classes concerned."

Happily for their cause that was not strictly accurate to-day. He himself had stood for many years behind the counter as a grocer's assistant; therefore he spoke with some personal knowledge, although he would not say that his personal knowledge would carry the House very far. In his youth he used to start work at seven in the morning, finish at nine in the evening, and had to be in bed at ten o'clock. On Saturdays the shop was kept open till eleven o'clock, and it only closed then because there was a licence attached to the business. The Act had entirely failed because it attempted to destroy selfishness by permissive agencies. They might as well try to prop up an avalanche with a lady's sunshade. This was a case, in the words of Professor Sedgewick,

> "Where the coercion, either of law or of the social sanction, wielded by a deliberate and vigorous combination, is *prima facie* indispensable, except in a perfectly ideal community of economic men."

From what had been said by his hon. friend the Member for Clitheroe, it would be acknowledged that they were not yet living in that ideal state. They did not rely altogether on the case set up by the shop assistants themselves, which stated that the present Act entirely failed because of the avarice of a few. *The Draper*, which was an influential journal, said—

> "There is no longer any disguising the fact that the Shop Hours Act has proved a dismal failure."

They made exhaustive inquiries in 175 towns, and found exactly the contrary of what they expected. Long hours prevailed, and no application had been made to the local authority for Orders. In some cases, where the hours were very long and application had been made for Orders, they had not been granted. In other cases where application had been made for an Order, it was where reduced hours had been in vogue for years. The *Grocer* newspaper in 1904 described the Act as a legislative steeplechase, and, after quoting its various clauses, said that even this legislative steeplechase was not run in accordance with the fair rules of sport, and that the people who were the non-starters could take away the prize. They found that the local authorities could refuse, and had refused, to make Orders, and that town clerks could dictate the conditions of the Orders. The town clerk of Burnley had laid it down, in reference to this matter, that a shopkeeper could vote according to the number of trades carried on under one roof. Many shopkeepers carried on trades which were not allied to their ordinary business. For instance, many grocers sold floorcloth, and while the seller would have the right to vote as a grocer, he would also have the right to vote as a dealer in floorcloth. A grocer might also sell pills and other things, and in that way he might get eight or ten votes. Then, as the deputation pointed out, it was impossible to get over the objections of the town clerk of Burnley, because every person might vote by proxy. There was no doubt about it that London was a great difficulty in regard to all social reform, owing to the different regulations which were imposed in different parts. To bring the Act into operation would cost each borough £50, and they did not apply for a closing order because it could be so easily upset. In Camberwell, taking the hours of the shops and striking an average, the shop assistants were liable to work seventy-five hours a week. It was useless to occupy the time of the House by talking of voluntary effort. Voluntary effort had been preached for forty or fifty years by well intentioned people, but it had broken down, and assistants engaged in grocers', fishmongers' and poulterers' businesses worked from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. and from 7 a.m. to 12 midnight. Surely that statement was eloquent testimony to the fact that, while we as a nation objected to slavery, it was still permitted in the British Islands. The question was, in his view, eminently one for speedy and effective legislation. Many employers of labour were discouraged, and had become disgusted with the working of the Act, and steps should be taken to remedy the present state of things. Nothing less than drastic compulsory powers would enable them to bring the selfish members of a trade to reason. They had most valuable evidence in support of their case, because the medical profession had borne their testimony to the great evil which was done to the health and life of shop assistants under the present system. One medical gentleman had stated that such hours as were worked by shop assistants were not only detrimental to the shop assistants themselves but were a danger to the community in which they lived. Thirty-eight per cent. of shop assistants fell victims to chest complaints, and in regard to one well known sanatorium it was declared that nearly fifty per cent. of the girls admitted had been shop assistants. In saying that this was a case for immediate legislation he believed the Labour Members had the sympathy of the Treasury Bench. He believed that the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Home Department, and other Members who sat upon the Treasury Bench, would see the justice of the demand of shop assistants for a uniform hour of closing on weekdays, complete closing on Sundays, except in certain scheduled cases, and the limitation of the hours of labour of the assistants, the maximum to be sixty hours a week including meal times. They claimed that the present condition of things was a national danger, and must lead, and had done so already, to the physical deterioration of the race. The occupation of shop assistants created more consumption than any other occupation throughout the length and breadth of the land, and all they asked was that the employer should be compelled to give reasonable hours of labour to those in their employ. The present state of things was to a great extent due to the system of multiple shops and stores and to the formation of large companies who forbade to any man the opportunity of rising, and made the majority of shop assistants simply wage earners throughout their lives. Therefore they were entitled to ask for the protection of the State, which, if afforded to them, would not only be an advantage to them, but might be a benefit to the public by preventing meretricious and shoddy articles being sold to them. Long hours broke down the constitution, and shop assistants were entitled to have compulsory legislation applied to them. He was sorry that the Minister for War was not in his place, because it might well be that in the reduction of shop hours the right hon. Gentleman might find some assistance in his policy for the creation of a new reserve and in regard to recruiting. It might be, if the policy he was advocating was adopted, that shop assistants would, for reasons of health and pleasure, join the Territorial Army which the Secretary of State for War proposed to set up, and thus render his task less onerous. The shop assistants of the country had begun to realise that there was something higher than bed, food, and work. They had begun to realise that they were human beings, and they wanted leisure time for study, pleasure, and recreation. He therefore appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to give them an explicit promise that he would introduce a measure limiting the hours during which shop assistants could be employed. He was one of those who believed that the best asset of the State was a physically robust man or woman, and it was the duty of the House to do all it possibly could to secure protection for those who were the victims of selfish cupidity on the part of their employers. The great majority of the employers were in favour of the Resolution, but were unable to conform to it because of the selfishness of a small minority who would not come into line. They asked, therefore, in the interests of the health of the assistants, and in the interests of justice, that the right hon. Gentleman would give some assurance that it was the intention of the Government to see justice done to a large number of the people of the country.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, in the opinion of this House, more drastic legislation with regard to the closing of shops and the hours of shop assistants is required."—(*Mr. Shackleton.*)

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, Central): A case for legislation was made out in 1904, and the evils with which the Act tried to cope were so fully admitted on that occasion, and have been so accurately described by the hon. Member who has just sat down, that I need not detain the House by again referring to them. The Resolution which we are now considering has been moved and seconded in speeches of much moderation and great force, and, in the judgment of the Government, the case for the Resolution has been made out. Now I pass for a moment to the working of the Act of 1904. I rather regret that the authors of that Act are not here to-night to look after the interests of their child, whose career has certainly not been satisfactory. That Act has been working for two years, and a good deal can be done in two years, and, if one does not do so much as one could hope, what is actually done in that time may be taken as proof of what can be done under the Act. Now what has been done? The total number of closing Orders under that Act for England and, Wales is only 112. They affect 9,000 shops, and, perhaps, 15,000 persons out of a possible total of some 800,000 assistants besides shopkeepers. Of the 112 Orders, ninety-two affect one trade only, and there are only twenty which concerned more than one trade. In districts where the Act is most seriously needed it has been practically inoperative. It has been practically inoperative in London and in many large towns. For instance, a Salford Order had to be revoked, because Manchester would not fall into line. Under the Act of 1904 only 112 local authorities have made Orders. Nothing has been done by 364 local authorities. That figure 364 includes county councils. The question is how are we to proceed upon this excessively meagre result of the Act of 1904. I have no doubt whatever that the framers of that Act honestly believed that the majority of shopkeepers would peacefully persuade the minority to adopt it, and come in under the Act, and that the Act would be a success. But permissive Bills based only upon hopes, wishes, and aspirations do not, as a rule, prove to be strong Acts in working. It is perfectly clear that the Act of 1904 could only be a success by the good will of those concerned, and by their being anxious to make it a success. On the other hand, to its opponents it provides a practically impenetrable zareba to which they can retire, and in which they are unassailable. What are the reasons why the Act is not a success? We know the general reason in London is that the framers of the Act, against the advice of Members of this House, made the central authorities the borough councils. The suggestion that it should be the County Council was not listened to. The result of that is that in these various areas there are competing and conflicting interests, and, in consequence, the Act has been in London a disastrous failure. As far as its general failure in the country is concerned, I may point out that there are five main stages which an Order has to go through before it can pass into law. First, the local authority has to be satisfied that a *prima facie* case has been made out. They then take certain steps and, if they are satisfied it is necessary to make the Order, they must have a satisfactory result from their own local inquiries. If two thirds of the occupiers of the shops affected by the Order are in favour of it, the Order passes to the Home Office, which is the central authority; and, lastly, it is laid on the Table of this House for the prescribed number of days. It is quite obvious that if there is no determination or wish to make the Act operative there is every opportunity of making it practically nugatory. I say emphatically that the Home Office have given this Act every encouragement in their power, and they have been the means of making operative a considerable number of the Orders which have been issued. One hon. Gentleman spoke of revocation of Orders by the Home Office. I hope I have shown that we look very carefully into these matters. But as regards revocations the Act oddly enough becomes mandatory. It says that where the local authority has been satisfied that a majority of the occupiers of shops to which a closing Order applied are opposed to the continuance of the Order, it shall apply to the Home Office for revocation of the Order. I need only say we have done so most reluctantly. Our difficulties are created by the Act we have to administer. I cannot exonerate the local authorities from blame. I am not able to show in how many cases, although satisfied that two-thirds of the occupiers were in favour of an Order, they have refused to make the Order. But they have not taken the initiative in order to rouse people to a sense of their duty in the matter. The difficulties which the Act has produced are enough to make weak-hearted people avoid it. It is difficult to obtain a two-thirds majority for this or any other purpose. An undue protection of interests has been given by law to the exclusion of the rights which the Act was designed to protect. And it is most extraordinary that the 800,000 people in England and Wales whose claims were admitted in 1904 have no power to set the law in motion. I agree that in

England and Wales the Act has proved woefully unsound. I should like for a moment just to remind the House of what was said by my hon. friend with regard to Scotland. In Scotland it has been a success, because, although there are only twenty Scottish Orders, twelve of them are of a large and composite character. Included in these Orders are different trades, but milkmen, bicycle makers, and motor shops are not included. In Glasgow, for example, the Order includes no less than forty-eight trades, and the figure given to me is so large that I cannot be responsible for it, namely, that the forty-eight trades include no less than 14,700 shops. If that be so, it is an extraordinary fact. But I guard myself, as I cannot vouch for the accuracy of it; but the success with which the Act has met in Scotland undoubtedly suggests that a good deal might be done if proper machinery were provided, and there was an honest intention to work it. There are a variety of methods of dealing with this question. There is the suggested Bill of my right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean, but I think that he will admit that it would undoubtedly take a great deal of time to pass. There are the alternative methods of a compulsory clause or a limitation of hours. There is a further alternative, that of a combination of the principle of the compulsory clauses with the principles of this Bill to amend the present Act. I am not asked to state our intention with regard to a Government Bill at the present time, and I do not commit myself on that point; but I frankly admit that the case for an amending Bill has been made out. This brings me to the question of when a Bill could be brought in. I confess that I speak on this point with some embarrassment. I made out a list of measures this morning for which the Home Office is being constantly pressed —Bills on the stocks and *in posse*. There are no less than twenty adumbrated measures on very important subjects. So far as the Home Office is concerned, to get through that list of measures would take at least two whole sessions of the legislative attention of the House. I am afraid that we should not get that. Therefore, I confess that it is with some hesitation that I get up and say that we accept the Resolution, and that we admit that there is a case for legislation, even with all these legitimate demands which are made upon us, and for which it is difficult to find time in the House. I do not want to be misunderstood. I do not wish it to be thought that in saying what I do, I am not in earnest on this particular subject. I admit the case, but I can only deal with a subject such as this, and with similar important subjects regarding the social and industrial position of the country, as well as I can when the subjects arise. I accept the Motion. I agree that the Act of 1904 has to a large extent failed in England and Wales, and at any rate it is the duty of Parliament to make good that Act, to remove what is admitted to be a great evil, an evil which still exists, and which, therefore, ought to be dealt with and removed by an amending Bill as soon as possible.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said his hon. friend in moving the Resolution, and his right hon. friend in replying, had so completely covered the ground that there was little left to be said on the subject. He thought the answer of the Home Secretary was all they could demand. He was himself an old friend of this cause, and he had been a promoter of the Bill named—The Shops Bill—for a good many years. As far as this limited subject went, nothing could be more perfect, he thought, than the speech of the Home Secretary. His right hon. friend had covered every point which his hon. friends desired to have answered. All that could have been said usefully, as to the delay of the Labour legislation of which this formed part, would be out of order in the present debate. There had never been an occasion when prophesies had been so conspicuously fulfilled as on this occasion. When this question was under discussion in the last Parliament there were debates in both Houses, and he had himself ventured to move the rejection of the Bill of 1904 on the Second Reading on the very grounds which had been put forward that night. Everything which was prophesied in that discussion by opponents of the Bill had come true, but eventually the Bill was passed, and, honestly, those who had opposed it did all they could to make the best of it when it came into force. As regarded London, Manchester, and Salford, all the difficulties prophesied had come about exactly as had been prophesied, and the House of Lords and the House of Commons must be said to have gone wrong deliberately on that occasion. They recognised the desire of the right hon. Gentleman to set right what had gone wrong and to put matters on the right lines. He hoped that an opportunity would be found to press this legislation forward, together with a good deal of other Labour legislation which was waiting to be dealt with.

MR. A. C. CORBETT (Glasgow, Tradeston) said that Lord Avebury was not responsible for the faults in the Act to which attention had been chiefly called that night. Lord Avebury was strongly opposed to having the authority for London vested in the municipalities instead of in the County Council. He was also opposed to the number of restrictions which multiplied the difficulties in the way of carrying out the Act. He desired to do the very utmost he could in behalf of overworked shop assistants. It seemed to him (Mr. Corbett) that it was a mistake to make allusion in the Resolution to the failure of the Act, because he believed that the strength of the case for further legislation depended mainly upon two reasons, namely, partly upon the failure of the Act itself—upon the fact that the shopkeepers themselves had not been prepared to carry out the restrictions as far as some of them had hoped, and on the success of the measure where it had been tried. In Glasgow this legislation had been acted upon without any difficulty and without any considerable friction. That was a great point in favour of carrying such legislation forward on more drastic lines. He would be glad to go with his hon. friends as far as he could in restricting the hours of shop assistants, but he could not regard this measure as being altogether a failure, seeing that it had brought something like comfort into so many miserable lives; for it was evident that some 40,000 or 50,000 persons had been benefited by the Act. If the words declaring the Act to have been a failure had been omitted he would have had much pleasure in voting for a Resolution in favour of more drastic legislation. He wished the Home Secretary could have given them a stronger assurance that something would be done by the Government. It was a pressing matter, and he trusted that, before this Parliament came to an end, some further practical steps would be taken to lighten the labours of those for whom so much sympathy had been expressed.

*MR. T. DAVIES (Fulham) assured the House that in many areas and in many boroughs in London they had done their best to get the Act put into operation. In the borough he represented, Fulham, at the very earliest opportunity they called a towns meeting, in January, 1905, and did their best to put the Act into operation, and so far as they were concerned it was a complete failure, because they could not get the majority required. At Camberwell the result was that practically no advantage accrued to the shop assistants as the hours agreed upon were no shorter than they were previous to the Order coming into force. All his life he had done what he could to reduce the hours of shop assistants in London, and his view was that the Act had been a complete failure in London, and that no Act could be successful unless the whole of London was treated, for this purpose, as one area. The same thing happened in other districts immediately outside London. The Act should be amended if it was to be of any benefit to shop assistants in London, and in order to be effective it should be on the lines of the Bill of the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean. Speaking from the shop assistants' point of view he said that the Bill should be general in character, compulsory as regarded its scope, and must contain a limitation of hours. He thought that sixty hours a week should be the limit for shop assistants exclusive of meal time. He was very glad that the Home Secretary had promised as soon as he had time to see that the Act was amended in the directions he had indicated.

SIR F. BANBURY said that as one who had taken a considerable interest in this question for the last fifteen years he would like to say a few words. He agreed that the Act had been a failure, but not for the reasons given by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean. He did not believe that any Act was required or that any Act would be successful. When he contested Peckham at the last general election he found that a considerable number of the small shopkeepers were going to vote against him because he had supported the Act of 1904, and because they resented any interference with the liberty of the subject. He took considerable trouble to convince those shopkeepers that they were labouring under a misapprehension, but they would not believe him. Of course they had not read the reports in *Hansard*, and they voted for the hon. Member for Peckham, who was now supporting the very measure for supporting which they voted against him. The Act of 1904 was unjust and unsuited to the habits of a free people. He strongly held to the view that the adult male should be free to use his labour as he saw fit. If he chose to work twenty hours a day he should be allowed to do so, and was to be respected for his physical capacity. This country had been made by men prepared to work to the best of their ability. He saw no reason why a small shopkeeper should keep his shop open at such hours as met the wants of his customers; in fact, that was the only chance he had of carrying on a business in competition with large establishments. No reason had been advanced for preventing the small shopkeeper from using his own labour in the manner which he thought was best suited to his own interests. As regarded the large establishments there was no necessity to have any Act at all, because they already closed at an early hour. The Bill of 1904 was brought in owing to an unfortunate agitation led by a noble Lord for whom he had great respect, but he was afraid that upon that occasion the noble Lord allowed his kindness of heart to run away with his judgment. He did not question the sincerity of hon. Members who had supported the Bill. The gentlemen who were agitating in favour of the measure were supporters of the then Government. They prevailed on the late Lord Salisbury to hold a Commission, and evidence of a very unfortunate character was heard. That was to say, the Commission listened to people who took one view of the matter, but the small shopkeepers, who did not even know of the existence of the Commission, were not heard. The result was that the Commission came to an erroneous conclusion. The Bill, as far as he could remember, was not passed unanimously. He could not conceive of such a thing being possible. One of the reasons why he objected to the Bill of 1904 was that he believed the whole agitation was got up on sentimental grounds. He then ventured to point out that there was a large number of people in different parts of London whose interest lay in having shops open at different hours, and that to lay down a hard-and-fast rule which would be enacted by the central authority would only result in failure or injustice. That was one of the reasons why the borough council was substituted for the London County Council. Another reason why the vast majority of shopkeeper did not want it was that the vast majority of consumers did not want it. He denied the accuracy of the statement that there was a general desire among the shopkeeping and purchasing classes that shops should be arbitrarily closed at a certain hour.

MR. SHACKLETON: Why did you vote for the Bill? In *Hansard*, on the Division on the Second Reading, among the "Ayes" is the name of Sir Frederick George Banbury.

SIR F. BANBURY said that, the hon. Member having drawn his attention to *Hansard*, he of course accepted his statement. He did not know what the circumstances were at the moment. There might have been something worse, and he took the lesser of two evils. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean was perfectly well aware of the action he had taken in this direction. He remembered that the right hon. Baronet made a speech in his constituency in which he said that it would be impossible to pass a Bill of this description as long as he himself was in the House. Therefore if for once his Party loyalty——

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: What I said was that it would be impossible for a private Member to pass such a Bill.

SIR F. BANBURY said it came to the same thing. He had never ventured to arrogate to himself the power to stop a Bill of the Government. He would endeavour on all occasions to do what according to his lights he considered to be his duty. If he believed he could stop a Government Bill of which he disapproved he would be proud to do it. The proof that there had been no general demand for the Act was to be found in the fact that it had been a failure. He knew it was perfectly useless to appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite to remember the old maxims of the Liberal Party. [Cries of "No."] Then he would appeal to them. The late Sir William Harcourt said that there should be no interference with individuals by the State, and that every man should have freedom to conduct himself according to his own lights. Those were the old doctrines of the Liberal Party. He was sorry his hon. friend the Member for Preston was not in his place; they were his views now, and he was the only true remnant of the old Liberal Party in the House. If the hon. Member were here now, he was sure he would support him. He would ask the Home Secretary on what ground a man who had a shop of his own should be obliged to close it at a certain hour. What was the argument from the Liberal point of view?

MR. GLADSTONE said he would make exactly the same answer as was given by the hon. Gentleman who brought in the Bill of 1904.

SIR F. BANBURY said he had always been against a Bill of this sort, and he did not know why he supported it. They all made mistakes sometimes. He was consoled by the fact that the right hon. Gentleman had expressed sympathy. It was easy to profess sympathy. Every Member on the Treasury Bench always professed sympathy. He was glad to see that they did not always go much beyond sympathy. If hon. Gentlemen below the gangway brought in a Bill to extend this Act he would vote against it.

*MR. J. D. WHITE (Dumbartonshire) hoped that the speech of the hon. Member for the Tradeston Division of Glasgow would not give the House the impression that Glasgow and other Scottish cities were industrial elysiums. As one fairly familiar with the conditions there, he would like to point out that in Glasgow and other Scottish cities the hours of shop assistants were in many cases too long. Some time ago he met in a shop in London an assistant who was formerly in similar occupation in Scotland. He told him that, though the conditions in London were far from desirable, they were better than the conditions from which he had come. He could assure the House that the conditions of work among shop assistants in Scotland required amending quite as much as in England. He spoke not only for the young men, but also for the young women assistants. Standing for long hours in an unwholesome atmosphere had even a worse effect on young women than young men. He would be sorry if anything that had fallen from the hon. Member opposite led the House to suppose that the conditions in Scotland should be left as they were. Scotland was, of course, outside the jurisdiction of the Home Secretary, but he ventured to hope that the right hon. Gentleman would use his influence to bring Scotland within the scope of any projected benefits. A reform of the conditions was needed in the interests of the shop assistants in Scotland fully more than in those of the same class in England.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow) said he quite agreed with the Resolution, because he believed that men and women were kept too long serving in the shops.

SIR F. BANBURY said he desired to make a personal explanation. He found on referring to *Hansard* that he had stated at the time that he did not approve of the Bill of 1904, and that the principle was one which, in his opinion, should never have been brought forward by a Conservative Government. To that opinion he adhered. He thought he had shown that he believed the borough councils would be better than the London County Council to administer the Act.

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, more drastic legislation with regard to the Closing of Shops and the Hours of Shop Assistants is required.—(*Mr. Shackleton.*)

TOWN DEVELOPMENT.

*MR. P. W. WILSON (St. Pancras, S.) said he desired to call the attention of the House to the question of town development, and to move, "That, in the opinion of this House, local authorities should be granted by legislation the power of laying out suburbs for building on a rational plan, which shall include adequate air space, convenient grounds for recreation, and facilities for locomotion, so preventing the grave evils which result from over-crowding in and around great cities." On 19th April the Prime Minister, in a speech delivered at the Holborn Restaurant, laid it down as the immediate aim of the Government's policy in regard to land and housing that—

> "Happy shall we be if before our day is over we see brightness and colour and pleasant homes for the people in our cities, and vigorous, well-nourished children playing in the gardens of our cities instead of in the dismal and sunless streets, which are too often the only playground open to them."

It was in the spirit of those sincere words that he ventured to submit this Motion to the House. He supposed that there were hundreds of thousands in this country earning their living in the building industry. Lord Rosebery once used the expression—

> "Are you a builder? If so, what, and where, have you built?"

Every one who had thought over this matter—not merely poets and idealists—agreed that the influence exercised by mere bricks and mortar was not only physical, but moral and intellectual, and assisted to an incalculable extent in the development of human life. Years ago the Borough of Finsbury, once a suburb, was built without a plan and had a population of 101,000 people. It had only two and a half acres of open spaces, Spa Fields one and three-quarter acres, and Spa Green three-quarters of an acre; and in South St. Pancras, which had a population of 60,000, the only open spaces consisted of three disused cemeteries of one and three-quarter acres in extent. The death rate for Hampstead was only half that of Finsbury—a fact which showed the value of open spaces. During the three or four years he had been living in Finsbury they had in the first place been building bigger schools, in the second place they had been building bigger public-houses, and in the third place they had been building a very much larger police station. His constituency of South St. Pancras was divided between the comfortably rich and the extremely poor, and, as he had said, they had 60,000 inhabitants and their open spaces consisted of three disused burial grounds, of which only two had been consecrated, the third being Nonconformist. What was the effect upon the race of the present state of things? Let them take Mafeking night, when there were millions in the streets cut off from the steadying influences of nature, breathing an artificial atmosphere and displaying a temperament that was hysterical, restless, and undisciplined. It was made the occasion of civic rejoicing, but what about the hunger and discontent which existed? The manning of cities and distribution of population involved not humanity merely, but national security. He did not want, however, to dwell upon the errors of the past, errors of ignorance, errors of apathy and errors of avarice; what he wished to point out was that the evil was continuing and spreading all over the country. They would find in the suburbs and in provincial cities like Middlesbrough large masses of houses built back to back in a uniform line, without any allowance in regard to air space, and embodying everything that was low and bad in its influence upon human life. What was the remedy for this impudent denial of æsthetic instinct? His hon. friend the Member for Cheshire had built one of the most wonderful garden cities in the country, and his hon. friend regarded this not as a question of philanthropic effort but as a matter of business, since human life was the raw material upon which all national prosperity must rest. What he wanted to bring to the attention of the House was the indispensable minimum which they ought to secure. He did not talk of luxuries, libraries, public halls, clubs, and swimming baths, but he contended that there should be gardens in the suburbs three or four times the size of the site of the house. Each road should have a width of not less than 100 feet; his right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board knew how difficult it was to widen streets after the houses had been erected. These things were possible, not merely in villages, but in towns. There should also be a given number of houses to the acre, accessible playgrounds, and the preservation of those rural features which went so far to humanise life. He supported the principle of garden cities as having a most beneficial effect upon human life. At Port Sunlight the inhabitants had a prospect of 110 years of life, and in another garden city there was the prospect of an average life of 140 years as against twenty-five in Finsbury. In these places the birth rate was 40 as against 27·9 in London. He brought these figures to the attention of the Government because he thought they had important bearing upon the question of old age pensions. There was a most interesting experiment going forward in London at the present moment. He referred to the Hampstead Garden Suburb, in which he understood the hon. Member for St. George's, Hanover Square, was interested. That was an experiment conducted upon 240 acres of land, taken over from the Eton College trustees, and the scheme had the powerful support of Sir John Gorst, Earl Grey, the Earl of Crewe, the Bishop of London, Sir Robert Hunter, Mr. Lyttelton, and others, who were endeavouring to bring poor and rich together on the outskirts of London, and the point he had in his mind in this regard was not that they had so much inequality between rich and poor, but that they lived apart. They thought that the time had come when the matter should no longer be left to private enterprise; they wanted municipal action, and he hoped they were to have a discussion later on on the question of land valuation. What was wanted was the principle of co-operation between the city and surrounding authorities. A most remarkable report had been issued by the Housing Committee of Birmingham, drawn up by Mr. Nettlefold, the chairman. That committee investigated the state of affairs in Germany and found that so long ago as 1875 there was legislation upon the lines suggested by the Motion. Nothing could be done towards settling the question until Parliament assented to legislation on general lines to prevent the building of unsuitable suburbs. In listening to hon. Members opposite he had been amazed by the description of the demands made by the working classes. What was it that the working classes asked for? They did not ask for luxuries, motor-cars, traps, or unlimited space, but merely for the bare amenities of life; some security for employment and for food, shelter, fresh air, and a bit of garden. These were the questions they were discussing on May-day. One hundred years ago May-day was a day of holiday and general rejoicing; to-day it was an occasion for labour agitation throughout Europe. That was his first observation. His second was that if they read history they would find that every empire had been judged by reference to its cities; that in the case of every empire there came a time of material abundance, when the activity of the race ran greatly ahead. That moment had come to us. We were building at an enormous pace all over the country, but we must remember that in doing so we were not merely building houses and streets out of which to get rents and rates; we were actually building the future of our race, and the supreme destiny of our Colonies and dominions beyond the seas. He begged to move.

*MR. JOWETT (Bradford, W.) said he seconded the Resolution because he thought it was a Motion which the House ought to discuss considering the immense population that lived in towns. He understood that 77 per cent. of the population of this country inhabited towns, and that being so, it followed that the condition of the towns was bound to have a great influence on he future of our race. The towns of to-day had been built without any preconceived plan and were the result of the mere monetary interest of various individuals. As a result there were no playgrounds to speak of in which the children could play; they had to play over the gutters, or in the backyards near the foul privies and middens with flies constantly passing between them and the pile of refuse so near at hand. There were thousands of places in towns where direct sunlight came for only a very short time each day. This was chaos, and the Resolution asked for an expression of opinion from the House that that chaos should come to an end, and that so far at any rate as future extensions were concerned, matters should be thought out before hand, and should be planned in such a way as would lead to healthy, vigorous life for the population which was now living, and was young enough to be influenced by the new conditions. The towns now were under serious disabilities in dealing with outside areas owing to the fact that other authorities were frequently responsible, and had to be consulted before an arrangement could be made. If the Resolution were passed, he would take it to include an expression of opinion that the outskirts of the towns, even though they were not under the authority of the town chiefly concerned, should also be subject to the plans of the same order, even if the central authority had to compel the subsidary authorities to conform to what was best. At the present time, the land of outside areas was owned by many different owners, and where there was separate ownership there was bound to be large and small plots, and it was impossible for those plots to be dealt with in such a way as to allow the most suitable class of building to be erected. All that was determined by the size and position of the plot. It often happened that one man found it impossible to build in a sensible and intelligent manner because his neighbour had built in such a way as to preclude any possibility of his doing so. Then, again, in some cases the owner of a piece of land found it impossible to utilise it to the best advantage because of the erection in close proximity of some premises for an offensive trade. Houses in the neighbourhood of the factory carrying on the offensive trade were deteriorated, and they had districts in which such factories were surrounded by houses to the great detriment of all concerned. The Resolution sought to put an end to that—if legislation followed, as they hoped it would—by imposing on the local authority the duty of making a plan which would bind these separate owners to follow some systematic method in dealing with their lands. In his own experience he had seen cases where owners of very small pieces of land had actually blocked the development of larger pieces by securing the outlet for drainage purposes. He had seen instances where speculators had bought land at a particular point, not for the purpose of using it, but for the purpose of preventing somebody else from having the opportunity of making use of their land, in the expectation that they would be bought out at a price which would leave them a large profit on the transaction. The Resolution was aimed at the destruction of action of that kind. To act upon the Resolution properly, it appeared to him that it would be necessary to expropriate the landlords or owners of the property which conflicted with the general interest. He did not use the word expropriate in the sense of confiscate; the owners ought to be dealt with on fair terms. He could quite understand how cases might arise where the owners might be perfectly innocent of any intention to injure the public welfare, and naturally, if such cases were dealt with, it should be on fair terms, and nobody on those Benches would wish otherwise, for they were not so unreasonable as might be sometimes supposed. They were not in the habit of going in for confiscation; they desired to do justice to all. But where property was in such a position that other property could not be properly dealt with if it were allowed to remain, or where it was in a dilapidated condition, then Parliamentary powers ought to be given to the local authority to allow them to remove the property which was of an obstructive character, or which injured other adjacent property, and to charge the adjacent owners for any benefit which they derived from its removal. As a patriotic Britisher he was sorry to have to admit that we were behindhand in these matters in comparison with other countries. In Germany this subject had already received the most careful attention from the very best men in the country, and for years they had been working on the lines indicated in the Resolution. He found from a publication issued by the Manchester and Salford Citizens' Association, that the town authorities in Germany, when large extensions were contemplated, went about their work in a most careful fashion. They took skilled advice in every direction, including not only engineers and surveyors and others, but even artists, in order that the work which they were about to execute might be beautiful as well as useful and beneficial. The reports prepared by the experts referred to were afterwards published and the public were asked to give their opinion. He mentioned that to show the immense pains taken in order that the work might be done properly. It was recognised in Germany that plans made for the development of land, and for the provision of sites for houses and buildings, should be so drawn as to cover if possible the needs of the next twenty or thirty years. Streets were arranged, open spaces were thought of, the general lie of the situation was properly discussed, and everything that they could think of for the public health was attended to, before any construction took place. He felt sure that the President of the Local Government Board, who was an old municipal administrator, would agree with him when he said that in Germany the State had encouraged localities to progress in this direction. The State had gone to the length of issuing general instructions calling upon local authorities to miss no opportunity of getting suitable land into their possession wherever they could. In this country, in times past, the efforts of local authorities in this direction had been throttled by the State. The Local Government Board, instead of saying "Buy where you can if the price is reasonable," had encouraged local authorities to sell land, and scores of public bodies had sacrificed thousands of pounds through being compelled to sell sites fronting public thoroughfares before they had developed, with the result that private speculators had reaped the benefit. He asked the House to give a sympathetic consideration to the Resolution. He thought hon. Members were agreed that legislation should follow, and he appealed to the President of the Local Government Board to grant the powers to local authorities which were indicated in the Resolution, which he begged leave to second.

Motion made and Question proposed—"That, in the opinion of this House, local authorities should be granted by legislation the power of laying out suburbs for building upon a rational plan, which shall include adequate air space, convenient grounds for recreation, and facilities for locomotion, so preventing the grave evils which result from overcrowding in and around great cities."—(*Mr. P. W. Wilson.*)

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) said there could be no more useful work for that House to do than to endeavour to prevent the evils of overcrowding, and to that extent he was in favour of the Resolution. No one would deny that there was in London a great absence of open air spaces and opportunities for recreation. It was also true that in the past due regard had not been paid to the way in which the rural population of the country had been decreasing. He did not agree that the conditions of things in this respect were much worse—especially in London—than in other countries. He had travelled a good deal, and he did not admit that the conditions in this country were worse. He very much deprecated the way in which the mover of the Resolution had blackened the character of London in this respect. The hon. Member had drawn a most dismal picture of Finsbury, for he had stated that they began in Finsbury with education, proceeded with intemperance, and ended with crime. He ventured to say that that was a somewhat dark picture, and it was hardly likely to be a correct one. The problem to be faced was that of overcrowding, and proper facilities ought to be provided in large towns for recreation. If the Motion had proposed more stringent legislation to prevent new suburbs being constructed on the old-fashioned plan without sufficient open air spaces he would have been able to support it, but he could not support any Resolution which proposed to allow local authorities to lay out suburbs in the way the hon. Member proposed.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): The subject-matter of this Resolution has evoked universal discussion during the last few years, and has aroused considerable interest amongst housing, social, and civic reformers. I venture to say that it would have been a great advantage to the House of Commons if time had permitted us to discuss at greater length the vital and interesting subject which is embodied in this Resolution. In the short space of time of ten minutes I have to reply to this Motion, and in so doing, may I say, that as a Londoner, as a cockney born and bred, I cannot accept the grey, dismal, melancholy impression of London given by the hon. Member for South St. Pancras. If the hon. Member's description is accepted London might be described as a place for workhousing the old, warehousing the women and children, and public-housing the men. May I say that that is an exaggerated view of what London is? I know of no city in the world which, for its size, is as sober, and for its conditions less criminal; and speaking with almost a unique experience as a Main Drainage Commissioner for eighteen years, I can say that I know no city so healthy, so clean, so much possessed of the crude essentials of good sanitation and physical decency as the great city in which this Parliament sits.

MR. P. W. WILSON was understood to say that what he intended to state was in the immediate neighbourhood of which he had personal knowledge the number of public-houses and convictions for drunkenness had greatly increased, and it had less open spaces than other metropolitan boroughs.

*MR. JOHN BURNS: All I can say is that in that respect the hon Member's constituency differs from mine, which has nearly the smallest number of publichouses of any parish, has 18 per cent. of open space in its total area, and on Easter Monday last, when 200,000 persons went in and out, there were only four cases at the local police station and three of them were strangers to the neighbourhood. But although I cannot accept the view of the hon. Member who moved this Motion as to the condition of London, I admit that the conditions under which large numbers of our people live are not as good as they ought to be, and not so good as they must be. It is as well that we should recognise the fact that in the last ten years there has been an extraordinary improvement in desire, in taste, and in appetite on the part of the people themselves for better conditions in the matter of housing. I venture to say that there is no other country in the world where there are so many comfortable homes. There is no country in which domestic architecture has developed further than in this city. I decline to accept even the pessimism of the hon. Member for North West Ham. But those amenities are possessed too exclusively by a small class. Their ideals are rapidly extending down to the poorest people whom we have in all our cities, and in so far as this Motion will enable us to assist the desire for better accommodation, then the Government will support it in the strongest possible way. May I say that there is hardly anything in the Resolution that local authorities are not now able to do, except one particular. Let me prove it. Let us go to Bourneville, the greatest triumph of housing and social experiment there is in the world. What has been done there, both as regards the amenities of the houses and the environments, is the best thing that has yet been done; but it must be remembered that what has there been done is in excess and advance of local by-laws. The same can be said of Port Sunlight, Garden City and Hampstead. I would take you to another type of illustration, namely, Chelsea. There you can see what one man co-operating with the local authority has been able to do in road and architectural improvement, and that mainly because he is one man acting in co-operation with the local authority, and, if I may say so, peacefully persuading the local authority to conform to his views. There you have seen a portion of London revolutionised in the direction this Resolution seeks to have developed everywhere throughout the country under the existing laws. But the difficulty comes in where you have a large area of land cut up by conflicting and divided interests, each exploiting his own portion and manipulating the property irrespective of the locality. There you see the very opposite of what has been revealed at Bourneville, Garden City, Millbank, Holborn, Chelsea and elsewhere. It is the business of those responsible for town government to see that local authorities who are willing shall have the means by which they can co-operate with private owners who are willing to bring about by their co-operation that which can be done by the individual where he is all powerful, or where he acts in conjunction with the local authority. We have got to devise some means of dealing with the recalcitrant and outstanding individual who believes in the mean street, the meaner house, the cheap and nasty tenement, and dear rents, who is for universal advertisement, and for the sordid and squalid conditions which we too often see our suburbs literally cursed with, because there is lack of community of action for the improvement of the district. I believe that the legacy of ugly buildings, mean streets, and brick boxes with slate lids, cannot be altered or removed until Parliament enable the local authorities to bring those interests together, and, failing agreement, to submit the issue to arbitration, and failing agreement and arbitration, to apply compulsion. I may tell the mover of this Resolution what has been done in order to carry out what is practical, sensible, and immediately pressing in the Resolution. We have, in accordance with a promise given to a town planning deputation which waited on the Prime Minister and myself six months ago, anticipated the Resolution moved by the hon. Member. I have before me two alternative Bills which are in process of drafting, by means of which we hope to achieve the important object referred to in the Resolution. The lines on which we would prefer to move would be that we should make provision in any scheme with respect to the manner in which streets and roads are to be laid down on the land; the parts of the land to be appropriated for open spaces or public purposes; the position in which houses may be built upon the land; the general character of the houses to be built; the conditions to be observed with the view to drainage or supply of water or light; and any other conditions which it may be considered desirable to impose with the view of making the best use of the area for building land, having regard to the circumstances of the case, and securing these and many other objects. Time does not permit me further to define or explain on behalf of the Government the plan which I have outlined. We freely and cheerfully accept this Resolution, and so soon as is practicable for us we shall place our proposals more fully before the House. It may be possible to bring in a separate town planning Bill which would meet with universal acceptance from all sections of the House for this desirable object. We intend to go forward with that town planning Bill, and when its objects are realised we hope we will be able to say—

> "We builded better than we knew,
> The conscious stone to beauty grew."

Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House, local authorities should be granted by legislation the power of laying out suburbs for building upon a rational plan, which shall include adequate air-space, convenient grounds for recreation, and facilities for locomotion, so preventing the grave evils which result from overcrowding in and around great cities.—(*Mr. P. W. Wilson.*)

NEW BILLS.

INCEST.

Bill to provide for the punishment of Incest, ordered to be brought in by Colonel Lockwood, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Crossley, Mr. Henry Joseph Wilson, Mr. Goddard Clarke, Mr. Maclean, Mr. John Wilson, and Mr. George Hardy.

INCEST BILL.

"To provide for the punishment of Incest," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 173.]

WAYS AND MEANS [24TH APRIL] REPORT.

Postponed Proceeding on Consideration of First Resolution, reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, "That Income-tax shall be charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, nineteen hundred and seven, at the rate of one shilling in the pound," resumed.

Motion made, and Question, "That further Consideration of the said Resolution be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Whiteley*) —put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be further considered upon Monday next.

Subsequent Resolutions to be considered upon Monday next.

Bill ordered, upon the Resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means of the 18th April and agreed to this day, to be brought in by the Chairman of Ways and Means, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Sydney Buxton, Mr. McKenna, and Mr. Runciman.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

On the Motion for the Adjournment of the House—

SIR F. BANBURY, referring to the debate on the Motion with respect to the failure of the Shop Hours Act, stated that on reference to *Hansard* he found that he voted, not in favour of the Second Reading of the Shop Hours Bill, but against the Amendment of the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, and that there was no division at all on the Second Reading. That, he submitted, conclusively proved that the hon. Member for Clitheroe was in error in saying that he voted for the Second Reading of the Bill. He asked the hon. Member to withdraw the statement which he had made.

MR. SHACKLETON said that on looking into the matter he found there was no Second Reading division; therefore the Member for the City of London could not have voted for the Second Reading. From the divisions and debate, however, it appeared that the right hon. Gentleman did support the Government.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR referred to the form in which the hon. Member for the Clitheroe Division had met the hon. Baronet's explanation. It affected the relations between hon. Members of the House. When the hon. Baronet was condemning the Shop Hours Bill the hon. Member asked why he voted for it, his sole object being to ridicule his hon. friend. The hon. Member ought to have withdrawn unreservedly the statement he had made instead of following it up in the manner he had done.

Adjourned at a quarter after Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, 2nd May, 1907.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificate from the Examiners that no Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bill:—Canal Tolls and Charges (New Junction Canal) Order Confirmation [H.L.].

The same was ordered to lie on the Table.

Pasley Children Legitimisation.—Petition of Thomas Hamilton Sabine Pasley, residing at Northlands, Cowes, in the Isle of Wight, praying for leave to introduce a Bill to declare legitimate certain children of Thomas Hamilton Sabine Pasley, together with a copy of the proposed Bill annexed thereto; read, and referred to the Examiners.

Murphy Grimshaw's Divorce (Validation).—Petition of William Howard Murphy Grimshaw, of 109, Cromwell Road, South Kensington, in the county of London, praying for leave to present a Bill to remove doubts as to the validity of a certain Decree, dated 30th October, 1893, of the High Court of Justice (Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division) dissolving the marriage solemnised on the 16th November, 1880, between William Howard Murphy Grimshaw and Mary Evalina Julia Murphy Grimshaw, then Mary Evalina Julia Woodward, spinster, and to confirm the said Decree, was presented, and read: Ordered that the said petition be taken into consideration on Monday the 13th instant and that notice thereof be given to the said Mary Evalina Julia Murphy Grimshaw: Leave given to the Petitioner and to the said Evalina Julia Murphy Grimshaw, to be heard by Counsel at the Bar upon the said petition.

Southport, Birkdale, and West Lancashire Water Board Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Ocean Accident and Guarantee Corporation Bill [H.L.].—Reported from the Select Committee, with Amendments.

Ashton-under-Lyne, Stalybridge, and Dukinfield (District) Waterworks Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, That the Committee continued sitting this day in the absence of the Marquess of Zetland; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Richmond (Surrey) Electricity Supply Bill.—Read 2^{a}, and committed.

Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill; Basingstoke Gas Bill. —Read 3^{a}, and passed.

Buckhaven Dock Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Select Committee, that it is not expedient to proceed further with the Bill; read, and ordered to lie on the Table.

Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill [H.L.].—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Lord de Mauley be proposed to the House as a Member of the Select Committee on the said Bill in the place of the Lord Teynham; read, and agreed to.

Broadstairs and St. Peter's Urban District Water Bill [H.L.].—The Order made on the 25th of April last, appointing certain Lords the Select Committee to consider the Bill, discharged.

Worthing Gas Bill.—Brought from the Commons; read 1^{a}; and referred to the Examiners.

London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough Market) Bill.—Read 3^{a} (according to order), and passed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

ALLOTMENTS AND SMALL HOLDINGS.

Memorandum of evidence contained in Parliamentary Papers as to the demand for allotments and small holdings and as to the difficulty of obtaining land for those purposes.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

TREATY SERIES, No. 12 (1907).

Exchange of notes between United Kingdom and Germany respecting the estates of deceased seamen, 16th February—21st March, 1907.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3770. Saxony (Chemnitz).
No. 3771. Turkey (Palestine).
No. 3772. Venezuela (Caracas).

ARTERIAL DRAINAGE (IRELAND).

Appendix to the Report of the Viceregal Commission on Arterial Drainage (Ireland).

Presented (by Command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (CITY OF MANCHESTER).

Order made by the Council of the City of Manchester, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the hours of closing for certain classes of shops within a certain part of the city; laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NEW BILLS.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to amend the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, with respect to laundries, and to extend that Act to certain institutions, and to provide for the inspection of certain premises—Was presented by the Earl Beauchamp; read 1ª; to be printed; and to be read 2ª on Tuesday the 14th instant. (No. 48.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL [H.L.].

A Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland relating to the rural district of Ballycastle, the Bangor and Newtonards Joint Hospital, County Down, and the urban district of Dalkey. Was presented by the Lord Denham; read 1ª; to be printed; and referred to the Examiners. (No. 49.)

SMALL HOLDINGS.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE: My Lords, I desire to ask the noble Earl opposite a Question of which I have given him private notice—namely, when he will be able to lay on the Table the Papers promised the other evening with reference to the subject of small holdings and rural depopulation.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES (Earl CARRINGTON): I have to apologise to the House for not having been able to produce the Papers earlier, but the amount of information is so enormous that there has been difficulty in condensing it. That must be my excuse for not having already laid the Papers, but I am able to promise that by Monday they will be in your Lordships' hands.

COMPANIES BILL [H.L.].

House in Committee (according to Order).

[The EARL of ONSLOW in the Chair.]

Clauses 1 and 2 agreed to.

Clause 3:—

VISCOUNT RIDLEY moved to substitute a penalty of £50 for £5. The clause provided that if a prospectus were issued without a copy thereof being filed for registration as required by Section 9 of the Companies Act, 1900, the company and every person who was knowingly a party to the issue of the prospectus should, on conviction, be liable to a fine not exceeding £5 for every day from the date of the issue of the prospectus until a copy thereof was so filed. He did not think £5 a sufficient penalty to deter unscrupulous directors. Although if his Amendment were agreed to the clause would provide that the penalty should be one not exceeding £50, it would, of course, be within the power of the Court, for merely technical breaches, to make the fine as low as they considered necessary to meet the particular case.

Amendment moved—

> "In page 4, line 32, to leave out the word 'five' and to insert the word 'fifty.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

LORD AVEBURY pointed out that the fine was one of £5 for every day. Therefore, if a number of days had elapsed between the issuing of the prospectus and the filing of a copy the fine would be exceedingly heavy. Moreover, it would fall on the company, the shareholders of which would not be in any way responsible for the offence. He hoped the noble Viscount would not press the Amendment.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said that all the penalties in the Bill had been carefully considered by the Board of Trade and their advisers. They felt that a fine of £5 in this case was sufficient. As Lord Avebury had pointed out, it was not a maximum fine of £5, but of £5 for every day from the date of the issue of the prospectus until a copy was filed.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 3 agreed to.

Clause 4 agreed to.

Clause 5 :—

VISCOUNT RIDLEY had an Amendment on the Paper to Clause 5 (limitation of time for issue of certificates), in which he proposed to increase the fine, in cases of default in complying with the requirements of the section, from £5 to £50 for every day during which the default continued. He would like to know from the noble Earl who represented the Board of Trade whether the same objection applied to the increase of the fine in this case.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said he was afraid the same objection would apply.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY intimated that in the circumstances he would not move the Amendment.

Clause 5 agreed to.

Clause 6 :—

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said the Amendments standing in his name to this clause had been put down at the instance of the Board of Inland Revenue. The object of the clause was to secure the filing of particulars of contracts in respect of which allotments of shares had been made, in cases where such contracts had not been put into writing. The Amendments were proposed in order to improve the drafting and to prevent any evasion of the stamp duties.

Amendments moved—

"In page 5, line 14, to leave out the words 'a contract which under' and to insert the words 'such a contract as is mentioned in'; in lines 15 and 16 to leave out the words 'is required to be filed with the registrar'; in lines 16 and 17 to leave out the words 'it shall be a sufficient compliance with that paragraph if the company' and to insert the words 'the company shall'; in line 21, after the word 'writing' to insert as new subsections:

"(2) Such particulars shall be deemed to be an instrument within the meaning of the Stamp Act, 1891, and the registrar may, as a condition of filing the particulars, require that the duty payable thereon be adjudicated under section twelve of that Act.

"(3) The provisions of section seven of the Companies Act, 1900, imposing penalties for default, shall apply as if the requirement of this section were a requirement contained in that section."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

LORD AVEBURY asked if it was quite clear that the proposed new subsections involved no addition to the stamp duties payable.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD replied in the affirmative. The only object was to prevent any evasion of the present stamp duties.

On Question, Amendments agreed to.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7 :—

VISCOUNT RIDLEY said this clause provided for the issue of shares at a discount under certain circumstances, and the object of the Amendment standing in his name was to secure that if such a practice were to be sanctioned at all, a point upon which he had considerable doubt, it should only be done under adequate safeguards. He held that it should only be allowed with the sanction of a special resolution of the company. The safeguard in his Amendment was not, he feared, a very large one. It might be possible to evade it, but he hoped the

Board of Trade would accept the Amendment. In many other matters of company management a special resolution of the company was required, and he submitted that in a very important clause of this kind, under which a great many doubtful transactions could take place, it was only proper that the power should be safeguarded as much as possible.

Amendment moved—

"In page 5, line 26, after the word 'may' to insert the words 'with the sanction of a special resolution of the company, passed and duly confirmed in manner hereinafter mentioned, and should such a course be desired by not less than 10 per cent. in amount of the shareholders with the subsequent approval of the court.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

THE EARL OF GRANARD said that when the clause was drafted it was recognised that safeguards were necessary, and consequently the provision was inserted that no company would be able to issue capital at a discount unless it had continuously carried on business for more than two years. They also insisted upon a statement being filed with the registrar giving exactly the same information as would have been contained in a prospectus, had one been issued. But in order to ensure further publicity the Government were prepared to agree to the noble Viscount's Amendment down to the word "company," thereby accepting the stipulation that such issue should be sanctioned by a special resolution of the company. They could not go further than that, as they thought it undesirable that a small minority of shareholders should have the power of continually harassing the directors, which he was afraid would be the case if the Amendment were agreed to in its entirety.

LORD LEITH OF FYVIE regarded it as extraordinary that they should be considering at this time of day the sale of stock at a discount, when every other country in the world had made it a *sine qua non* that stock should never be issued at a discount. If this power were granted there should be adequate safeguards. In Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, and throughout the United States, the issue of stock at a discount was prohibited by law, and he was surprised that there was no Amendment on the Paper raising this question.

*LORD FABER reminded the noble Lord who had just sat down that though there was in the countries referred to no sale of stock at a discount, yet a heavy fee was paid to underwriters which had the effect of a discount.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord LOREBURN) said there was no doubt that dangers surrounded the issue of shares at a discount. But at present it was lawful to pay an underwriting commission on the issue of shares, which was practically the same thing. It was not thought desirable that the law should in practice be something in the nature of a sham, and therefore this clause, with its safeguards, was proposed. He would be glad if noble Lords at a later stage would suggest any further safeguards to the practice, as, for example, some method providing that all the shares in the same issue should be issued at the same discount. He had served on the Committee until a late stage, and believed most of the members were of opinion that it was better to make the thing genuine than to keep it on its present artificial and fictitious footing. The Government had accepted the vital part of the noble Viscount's Amendment, but he suggested that instead of requiring a special resolution of the company the Amendment should read "an extraordinary resolution," which would necessitate only one meeting, whereas a special resolution would require two.

THE MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE suggested that his noble friend should leave the matter where it had been left by the Lord Chancellor. What was really before the House was not whether it was desirable to permit the practice of issuing shares at a discount, but whether a particular safeguard against the abuse of that practice should or should not be adopted. He understood that the Government were prepared to meet Lord Ridley up to a certain point at all events, and if the noble and learned Lord would consider whether any further precautions were possible, he for one would be quite content to leave it there.

Viscount RIDLEY accepted the suggestion of the Lord Chancellor and deleted from his Amendment all the words after "company," and substituted the word "extraordinary," for the word "special."

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Viscount RIDLEY inquired whether the noble Earl in charge of the Bill was prepared to accept his next Amendment, to insert the words "provided that such shares shall first be offered to existing shareholders."

*The Earl of GRANARD said the Government could not accept the Amendment. The directors in the ordinary course would meet the shareholders at the general meeting, and if it were desired to impose any condition on the issue of shares at a discount it could be done then.

Viscount RIDLEY said he would not, therefore, move the Amendment. The question could be considered between this and the Report Stage.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 8 and 9 agreed to.

Clause 10:—

*The Earl of GRANARD said his next Amendment was moved at the request of the India Office, who desired that Clause 10 (Payment of interest out of capital) should not over-ride the Indian Railway Company's Act, 1894.

Amendment moved—

"In page 7, line 12, after the word 'relate' to insert as a new sub-section '(2) Nothing in this section shall affect any company to which the Indian Railway Company's Act, 1894, as amended by any subsequent enactment, applies.' "—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 10, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 11:—

*The Earl of GRANARD moved to leave out the following proviso—

(i) In the case of a mortgage or charge created out of the United Kingdom, it shall not be necessary to send the instrument by which the mortgage or charge is created.

This Amendment was also moved at the instance of the Board of Inland Revenue. Its object was to prevent the evasion of stamp duties. If it were not obligatory for the deeds to be produced before the registrar it would be impossible for him to judge whether or not the duty on them had been paid.

Amendment moved—

"In page 8, to leave out lines 2 to 5."—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*The Earl of GRANARD moved the insertion of a new sub-section, the object of which was, he said, to remove any doubt as to whether a debenture the term of which was extended required fresh registration. The desire was to make it clear that if the life of a debenture were increased the extension would require registration.

Amendment moved—

"In page 10, line 24, after the word 'sufficient' to insert as a new sub-section '(9) Where a debenture containing or giving by reference to a deed containing a charge required to be registered under this section is renewed by extending the currency thereof beyond the date originally fixed, such renewal shall require to be registered under this section as if it were a fresh charge. (*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 11, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 12 to 15 agreed to.

Clause 16:—

Viscount RIDLEY moved a similar Amendment to this clause (Power to give Mortgagee option of purchase) as that which had been agreed to on his Motion with regard to Clause 7, providing that the power should only exist with the sanction of an extraordinary resolution of the company.

Amendment moved—

"In page 11, line 37, after the word 'company' to insert the words 'with the sanction of an extraordinary resolution of the company.' "—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

*The Earl of GRANARD said the Government could not accept the Amendment, as in their opinion the conduct of all company affairs should be left as much as possible with the directors. They feared that if the Amendment were accepted it would unduly hamper business and hinder a company borrowing money. The main clause allowed a mortgagee to be given an option of purchase, and he reminded their Lordships of a case tried some years ago in which Lord Halsbury and the other Law Lords expressed regret that the existing state of the law prevented a mortgage being issued with option of purchase attached.

Lord AVEBURY hoped the noble Viscount would not press the Amendment. This clause stood on a different footing from the one authorising the issue of shares at a discount. Where the raising of an advance was required it might be a question of time, and, if the company had to wait for an extraordinary meeting, it might happen that, although the company was perfectly solvent and might have made all necessary arrangements if unhampered, in the meantime it would have to stop payment.

Viscount RIDLEY fully recognised that this was a highly technical matter. He would not, therefore, press the Amendment now; but perhaps the noble Earl in charge of the Bill would allow him to consult with him before the Report Stage.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 16 agreed to.

Clauses 17 to 19 agreed to.

Clause 20:—

Viscount RIDLEY moved to amend sub-section (3) so as to provide that where inspection of the register was refused, or a copy refused, the company should on conviction be liable to a fine of £20. The fine at present in the clause —£2—was quite inadequate, and as the fine was not one per day he hoped the objection which had been taken to his previous Amendment would not apply.

Amendment moved—

"In page 13, line 19, to leave out the word 'two' and to insert the word 'twenty.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

*The Earl of GRANARD said the Government could not accept the Amendment except in a qualified form. The Bill at present made the fine £2, and a further fine of £2 for each day the refusal continued. The Government would agree to the first fine being raised to £5.

Viscount RIDLEY: Could not the noble Earl make it £10?

*The Earl of GRANARD: I am afraid not.

Viscount RIDLEY: Then I will alter the word "twenty" in my Amendment to "five."

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 20, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 21:—

Lord AVEBURY proposed that one at least of the auditors, in the case of every company whose authorised capital amounted to £50,000, should be a professional accountant. This provision was necessary because auditors not specially trained in accounts sometimes overlooked matters that ought to be brought to light. The auditing of accounts was a very technical, he might almost say scientific, business, and it was extremely desirable in the interests of the shareholders that one at least of the auditors in all important companies should have had professional training. He had been told that the term "professional accountant" was not exactly a legal term, but he could not insert "chartered accountant" because there were many excellent accountants who were not chartered. There was a precedent for the words he proposed in the Public Trustee Act, which enacted that accounts should be audited by a solicitor or public accountant; and for the last thirty years the term "public accountant" in that Act had been taken to mean a person in the profession of an accountant. But even if it should be held that there was not a very clear legal definition, still there was no doubt that the insertion in the Act of words of the kind proposed would have very great effect in inducing companies to appoint as one of their auditors a person who had been really trained to that duty. He had known several cases where otherwise excellent auditors had, through not having special training, overlooked frauds which a professional accountant would at once have detected. In the interests, therefore, of the shareholders of these companies he hoped his Amendment would be accepted.

Amendment moved—

"In page 13, line 32, after the word 'auditors' to insert the words 'one at least of whom, in the case of every company whose authorised capital amounts to fifty thousand pounds, shall be a professional accountant.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*LORD FABER said this point came up before the Committee, and it was felt that there was great difficulty in ascertaining what was meant by a professional accountant. The Committee were told that it would really mean an accountant who belonged to one or other of the chartered societies. The Committee felt that that would be narrowing the appointment too much, and it was therefore left to the company. Though the Amendment looked very reasonable on the face of it there was still the same ambiguity as to what the term "professional accountant" really meant. In his opinion it would lead to more harm than good to stereotype the matter in the way proposed, and he therefore hoped the Amendment would not be pressed.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said the Government could not accept the Amendment in the form proposed. He suggested that the words might run—

"One at least of the auditors shall be a person who publicly carries on business as an accountant."

LORD AVEBURY accepted this suggestion, and asked permission to withdraw his Amendment as previously worded and to substitute one in the terms suggested by the noble Earl.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In page 13, line 32, after the word 'auditors,' to insert the words 'one at least of the auditors shall be a person who publicly carries on business as an accountant.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

LORD ASHBOURNE still thought the words proposed were vague. Any person who merely had a brass plate fixed to the door of an office, and who knew nothing whatever about the business of an accountant, might claim publicly to carry on that business.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said the object, of course, was to make sure, if possible, that a competent person would be appointed. That could not be done by a definition of professional accountant, because that might set up a monopoly for those who belonged to a limited number of societies. On the other hand, a perusal of the records at the Board of Trade would show many comic instances of the type of person who had been employed by bogus companies as an accountant, a term which had no definite meaning in law. Extraordinary persons had been put forward as accountants merely to discharge a sham duty. If a satisfactory term could be found, he, for one, would be glad; but, as Lord Granard had said, there was a precedent for the requirement that the person should publicly carry on the business of an accountant. This provision would at least exclude a number of objectionable persons, but he agreed with his noble and learned friend opposite that it was not an ideal one.

THE EARL OF GALLOWAY submitted that it was quite unnecessary to insist on a professional accountant. The most successful company in this country was the Army and Navy Co-operative Society; yet ever since its inception the auditors had been military men.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD AVEBURY moved an Amendment to Sub-section (3) to provide that "the balance-sheet shall be signed by two of the directors of the company."

He said that as the directors were really the responsible persons, it would be more satisfactory that two of them should sign the balance-sheet.

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 5, at the beginning of Sub-section (3), to insert the words 'The balance-sheet shall be signed by two of the directors of the company and.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said the Government had no objection to this Amendment, which simply applied to all companies the existing rule as to banking companies.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD AVEBURY moved to omit the words "and by the company to every shareholder not less than seven days" from Sub-section (4), which read—

"A person, other than a retiring auditor, shall not be capable of being appointed auditor at an annual general meeting unless notice of an intention to nominate that person to the office of auditor has been given by the nominator to the company not less than fourteen days, and by the company to every shareholder not less than seven days, before the annual general meeting."

He contended that under the subsection, if shareholders gave notice of their intention to nominate a new auditor, the directors might defeat their object by omitting to give notice to every shareholder. It might be said that that could be avoided by inserting corresponding words at a later part of the subsection, but he hoped that would not be done, because the effect of putting in those words would be that any enterprising firm of accountants might get some person to nominate them as auditors of a great company and then there would be imposed upon the directors the obligation of sending an intimation of the nomination to every one of the shareholders. In that way a substantial expenditure might be imposed on a company in order to advocate some young person who perhaps did not at all deserve it. The object of deleting the words in his Amendment was to enable the shareholders, if they really wished to do so, to change the auditors. He suggested that it would also be desirable to insert words providing that where a change was made notice of the change should be given to the existing auditors. Perhaps the noble Earl in charge of the Bill would consider that point before the next stage.

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, lines 14 and 15, to leave out the words 'and by the company to every shareholder not less than seven days.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*LORD FABER pointed out that if this Amendment was accepted the directors might appoint a new auditor without giving the shareholders notice. In his opinion it would be very dangerous to leave out the words requiring this notice.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said the Amendment had produced something like consternation among gentlemen who had communicated with him from Scotland, and who thought the Amendment would have an opposite effect from that desired. The words in the clause were, in his opinion, a protection to the shareholders, and he hoped they would be retained.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said that if the Amendment were accepted the directors would be able to spring the appointment of an auditor on the shareholders, as there would be no obligation whatever upon the directors to send notice of a proposed change to the shareholders. He suggested that the matter should be left over until the Report stage.

*LORD AVEBURY was quite willing to agree to this course, but thought there was some obvious misunderstanding as to the effect of the clause. The clause did not say that the directors should give notice to the shareholders, but that if they did not, the shareholders could not make a change. The clause had an exactly opposite effect from that which Lord Balfour and Lord Faber supposed. Let them take the case where shareholders wished to change an auditor. As the clause stood they would give notice to the directors, but unless the directors themselves gave notice to all the shareholders the auditor could not be changed.

As the clause at present stood the directors had nothing to do, if they wished to prevent the change, but to put the nomination in the waste-paper basket.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH held that the omission of the words would not cure the evil which the noble Lord feared, because if no notice were given to the shareholders of an intended change the shareholders who approved of the existing auditor and did not wish a change would probably not come to the meeting, as they would be ignorant of the proposal. The directors, would, therefore, have their own way. He did not see how they could secure effective notice being given to the shareholders without laying the obligation on the directors.

LORD AVEBURY said that, if the words were left in, the auditors, however much the shareholders might wish it, could not be changed unless the directors gave the notice. He would not pursue the matter further now, but would let it stand over till Report stage.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Consequential Amendment agreed to.

LORD AVEBURY moved to add a new sub-section to provide that where, in any prospectus issued by a company, any person was named as the auditor, the said person should, unless he resigned the appointment, continue to be the auditor until the first annual general meeting succeeding the issue thereof. This Amendment was, he said, intended to guard against cases in which a highly respectable firm of accountants were advertised in the prospectus as auditors, and then, before the next meeting, were displaced and someone else more under the control of the directors appointed in their stead.

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 22, after the word 'pounds' to insert the following new sub-section: '(6) Where in any prospectus issued by a company any person is named as the auditor the said person shall, unless he resign the appointment, continue to be the auditor of the said company until the first annual general meeting succeeding the issue thereof.' "—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said there was so much similarity between the sub-section proposed by the noble lord and that already existing in the Companies Act of 1900, that he trusted his noble friend would not press the Amendment. The section in the Companies Act read—

> "The first auditors of a company may be appointed by the directors before the statutory meeting, and, if so appointed, shall hold office until the first annual general meeting, unless previously removed by the shareholders at a general meeting."

He had inquired that day as to whether this section in the Act of 1900 had worked well, and had been informed that since the Act came into force there had been no trouble such as the noble Lord had referred to.

LORD ASHBOURNE said there was a word in the Amendment which was not to be found in the Companies Act of 1900. Removal was provided for in that Act, but not resignation. He thought it would be wise to provide that a company should be bound, if an auditor resigned, to make the fact public.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR thought the Amendment weakened the existing law. At present the auditor continued to be the auditor, not until he resigned, but until publicly removed. This business bristled with difficulties, and if the noble Lord would communicate with him he would consider the matter before the Report stage.

LORD AVEBURY said they were, of course, all aiming at the same object, and he gladly accepted the noble and learned Lord's suggestion.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 21, as amended, agreed to.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH moved to insert a new clause after Clause 21 to provide that in the case of companies registered in Scotland the summary mentioned in Section 26 of the Companies Act, 1862, in addition to the particulars required to be specified by that section and by Section 19 of the Companies Act, 1900, should also specify the total amount of debt due from the company in respect of all mortgages and charges. The Amendment had been suggested to him by a society of accountants in Scotland, who thought that, having regard to the provisions of the Scottish law, it was desirable that this information should be given. He had sent a detailed memorandum to the noble Lord who represented the Board of Trade, in order that he might be enabled to say whether or not the Board of Trade considered the Amendment an improvement. He would feel quite satisfied on a point of this kind with the opinion of the Board of Trade. He understood that the Amendment would carry out the recommendation of the Departmental Committee which reported about two years ago; but if the Board of Trade, having considered the effect of the proposal, said it would not be a good Amendment, he was not prepared at the present moment to divide the House upon it.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 21, to insert the following new clause:—

"In the case of companies registered in Scotland the Summary mentioned in Section 26 of the Companies Act, 1862, in addition to the particulars required to be specified by that section and by Section 19 of the Companies Act, 1900, shall also specify the total amount of debt due from the company in respect of all mortgages and charges.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said the Board of Trade had always been in favour of the clause as moved by his noble friend. The only reason it was not incorporated in the Bill in the first instance was that the Board of Trade had not then received a reply from the Scottish Office.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 22:—

*THE EARL OF GRANARD moved an Amendment, the object of which was, he said, to attach a penalty to failure to file an annual statement of assets and liabilities.

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 25, to leave out the words 'annually forward to the registrar with' and to insert the words 'include in.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said his friends in Scotland were afraid that the Amendment as now worded would have an opposite effect, and might operate to prevent companies filing their balance sheets. If so that would be very unsatisfactory, because the filing of the actual balance sheet, as audited and presented to the shareholders, was the most satisfactory way of making the position of the company public.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said the point was really one of drafting. The clause now read—

"Every company required to forward to the registrar a summary under Section 26 of the Companies' Act, 1862, shall annually forward to the registrar with that summary a statement of its affairs."

If the Amendment were accepted it would run—

"Every company required to forward to the registrar a summary under Section 26 of the Companies Act, 1862, shall include in that summary a statement of its affairs."

The Amendment only meant that, instead of sending an accompanying document, the statement of the affairs of the company should be included as part of the summary.

LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said the provision as it stood in the clause implied the forwarding of another document which had been audited and made public. The operation of the word "include" did not seem so distinctly to connote the actual balance sheet. But if the noble and learned Lord was clear on the point he had nothing further to say.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

LORD AVEBURY moved to leave out the words "of its affairs" from the provision as amended, and as read a moment before by the Lord Chancellor.

He understood that the Amendment would be accepted.

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 26, to leave out the words 'of its affairs.'"—(*Lord Avebury.*)

*THE EARL OF GRANARD accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH moved an Amendment designed to secure that the clause should not apply to a private company unless such company had created a mortgage or charge as defined by subsection 1 of Section 11 of the Bill. He said there was a large class of private companies in the country which were more or less family affairs, the shares being held, as a rule, by relations, and not being alienable to the public at all. It seemed unnecessary that companies of that kind, which did not go to the public for mortgages or debentures, should be asked to disclose their affairs.

Amendment moved—

"In page 14, line 32, after the word 'loss' to insert the words 'this section shall not apply to a private company unless such company has created a mortgage or charge as defined by subsection one of section eleven of this Act.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said many people looked upon small companies, with shareholders limited to friends and members of a family, as being in the nature of partnerships. The difference was that in the case of a partnership the liability of each partner was unlimited, while in the case of a limited company the liability was only on the assets of the company, and not unlimited, as in the other case. It was not quite logical, when they required ordinary limited companies to file an annual statement, not to require the same thing from a private company.

*LORD FABER thought that the Amendment, if agreed to, would strike a very heavy blow at the Bill. After all, the man who was concerned most vitally in the matter of limited companies was not the shareholder but the creditor. In limited companies, and more especially in the small limited companies, the shareholder knew all about the company, but the creditor did not. Private companies were generally turned into limited companies for family reasons, but there was a class of man who turned his company into a limited company because he desired to escape liability. In the former case the absence of a requirement that the company should disclose its affairs did not very much matter, but in the case of a man whose only desire was to escape liability and responsibility it was of vital importance that the creditor should know the position of the company. No man was obliged to turn his private company into a limited company, and if he came under the protection afforded by statute to a limited company there was no reason why he should not be compelled to file a statement showing, not how he was going on, but how the limited company was going on.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said the existing law was liable to abuse in this sense, that people might carry on business under a limited liability and keep the public entirely in the dark as to their financial position. That might operate hardly on the shareholders, who might be cheated into taking shares, but it might operate with still greater severity towards the creditors, who had no opportunity whatever of knowing what was the financial position of the concerns with which they were asked to deal, and who yet found that under the limited liability law they were unable to recover their debt. Banking companies now were obliged to publish their statements of affairs, and they had done it without objection for many years, while private bankers, who were not by statute obliged to do so, had followed suit. The object of this amendment of the law was to secure publicity as to the true state of affairs of a company in order that the creditors and those who dealt with it might know where they were. He did not think it was unfair that private companies should be asked to give this public information in return for the limit of liability which was bestowed upon them by statute. On principle, he could not see any reason why people who took advantage of the limitation which the law gave them in their liability should not accept the legitimate consequences of that limitation. He did not think it was unfair, and he did not think it would hurt these companies. He would be very sorry indeed to do anything of the kind, because he knew perfectly well that the great bulk of business in this country was done by limited companies, and that they were mostly honestly conducted. They had to steer between the danger of injuring the public enterprise of companies, and the danger of the swindles which took place on a considerable scale every year. It seemed to him they could not complain if people asked that these companies should, like bankers, give public information as to what their financial state was in return for the protection which the law offered.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said he adhered to his opinion that the Bill as it stood pressed unduly hardly upon private companies in making them disclose their affairs, with which nobody could have any real concern. But, in deference to the weight of opinion on both sides of the House, he should not press his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 22, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 23 and 24 agreed to.

Clause 25:—

VISCOUNT RIDLEY said the fine in this clause was for a serious offence and should be increased. The clause substituted the following section for Section 49 of the Companies Act, 1862—

"A general meeting of every company shall be held once at least in every calendar year, and not more than fifteen months after the holding of the last preceding general meeting and if not so held, the company, and every director, manager, secretary, and other officer of the company, who is knowingly a party to the default, shall on conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding fifty pounds."

He moved that the fine of £50 should be per day for every day in default. The Amendment was safeguarded by the fact that only those who were knowingly parties to the default could be mulcted. The offence could be a very serious one for shareholders, and he hoped the Government would accept the Amendment.

Amendment moved—

"In page 15, line 23, after the word 'pounds' to insert the words 'per day for every day in default.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

LORD AVEBURY hoped the Amendment would not be pressed. The company would have to pay the fine, and it would be very hard on the shareholders if, through some mistake of the directors or officials, the meeting was not held for some time. He could not help feeling that the provision in the clause as it stood was quite sufficient.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY thought the objection which Lord Avebury had taken would be removed if the words "the company and" were omitted. The clause would then read—

"And if not so held every director, manager, secretary," etc.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said it was very difficult to draw the line. They did not wish to worry directors. It was essential that good men should be obtainable as directors, and he did not think it would be advisable to expose them to such a penalty as that proposed by the noble Viscount, because what they did might be done through a slip though knowingly done. Under the Amendment an honest man might find himself liable to considerable fines for an offence which was not a very serious one.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY submitted that it was not likely, in cases such as the noble and learned Lord had mentioned, that the maximum penalty would be imposed.

On Question, Amendment negatived.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY moved to insert a new sub-section to provide that at least twenty-one days notice, exclusive of the date by which proxies must be lodged, must be given of all meetings of every company. At present, he said, the notice was only seven days. That might be sufficient in certain cases, but, in the case of companies who desired to evade the provisions of the Act and not to fulfil their obligations, the limit of seven days could be used in such a way as to make the notice nugatory and to render any combined agitation on the part of the shareholders entirely useless. It was possible, and it was done in certain cases, to hold meetings on 28th December. The previous three days were practically non-business days, so that, with the provision as to the lodging of proxies, they gave no opportunity to shareholders of combining amongst themselves, and placed the whole proceedings entirely at the mercy of unscrupulous directors. He attached great importance, therefore, to an increase in the time for the serving of notice.

Amendment moved—

"To insert as a new subsection: '(2) At least twenty-one days notice exclusive of the date by which proxies must be lodged must be given of all meetings of every company.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said the noble Viscount had put a very extraordinary case. Personally he would have no sympathy with a company which held its meeting on 28th December under such circumstances as the noble Viscount had indicated. Care must be taken not to hamper legitimate companies which desired to make changes in their articles of association. If there had to be twenty-one days notice of each meeting, proceedings in connection with even the smallest change in the articles of association would be spread over three months.

*LORD FABER expressed a certain amount of sympathy with the Amendment. Seven days was too short a time in which to issue proxies and to get them in again. But, on the other hand, twenty-one days was too long, and might lead to "lobbying" which was to be avoided. He suggested the reduction of the period of notice to fourteen days.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said that if the noble Viscount would agree to a notice of fourteen days the Government would be willing to accept it.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY said he would be glad to alter his Amendment accordingly.

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 25, as amended, agreed to.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY moved to amend this clause, which provided that—

"The Court may, if it thinks fit, on the application of any member of a company, call or direct the calling of a general meeting of the company,"

by the addition, at the end, of the words, "or direct the suspension of any meeting."

Amendment moved—

"In page 15, line 25, after the word 'company' to insert the words 'or direct the suspension of any meeting.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

*LORD FABER did not think it advisable to throw too much responsibility on the Board of Trade in this matter. It was not the duty of the Board of Trade to manage a company, but to see that when a company was being formed true *data* were given to the shareholders. If the shareholder had true *data* before him he must be the master of his own destiny, and it was not advisable to call in the Board of Trade unnecessarily.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said the Government were not disposed to accept the Amendment. They did not wish to enable individual Members to worry companies unduly. The clause, as it stood, gave power to call or direct the calling of a general meeting of the company, and he did not think the Court should be asked to interfere any further in the matter.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 26 agreed to.

Clause 27:—

VISCOUNT RIDLEY moved an Amendment to provide that a poll might be demanded at a meeting of a company on any motion for adjournment as well as on any special resolution. It frequently happened that directors of a company whose conduct was attacked by shareholders adjourned the proceedings time after time in their own interest under the rule which placed the adjournment entirely in the hands of the chairman.

Amendment moved—

"In page 15, line 26, after the word 'demanded' to insert the words 'on any resolution whether for adjournment or otherwise.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said there might be cantankerous shareholders bent on worrying the company, as well as unscrupulous chairmen; and it was perhaps better to leave such a matter as the adjournment of the meeting to be regulated by each company in its articles of association.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY hoped the noble and learned Lord would consider the point a little further. He was assured by many who had close acquaintance with the affairs of companies in the City that the case which he had put in moving his Amendment was one which frequently occurred. The particular companies which might take the course his Amendment was designed to prevent were just the companies whose articles of association could not be trusted to regulate the matter.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said the Government would consider the point in the light of what the noble Viscount had said.

Amendment, by [leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

Clause 27, as amended, agreed to.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY moved the insertion of a new section after Clause 27. He assured the Committee that the proposed section was not so formidable as it looked. The only difference between this section and the section which it proposed to amend consisted in the word "like" in the middle of the clause. The new section provided that when a resolution had been passed by a majority of not less than three-fourths of the members, that resolution should be confirmed by a "like" majority at a subsequent meeting.

At present a resolution passed by a majority of not less than three-fourths had only to be confirmed by a bare majority.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 27, to insert the following new clause, 'The following section shall be substituted for Section 51 of the Companies Act, 1862: A resolution passed by the company under this Act shall be deemed to be special whenever a resolution has been passed by a majority of not less than three-fourths of such members of the company for the time being entitled, according to the regulations of the company, to vote, as may be present in person or by proxy (in cases where, by the regulations of the company, proxies are allowed) at any general meeting at which notice specifying the intention to propose such resolution has been duly given and such resolution has been confirmed by a like majority of such members for the time being entitled according to the regulations of the company, to vote, as may be present in person or by proxy at a subsequent meeting of which notice has been duly given, and held at an interval of not less than fourteen days nor more than one month from the date of the meeting at which such resolution was first passed. At any meeting mentioned in this section, unless a poll is demanded by at least five members, a declaration of the chairman that the resolution has been carried shall be deemed conclusive evidence of the fact, without proof of the number or proportion of the votes recorded in favour of or against the same. In computing the majority under this section when a poll is demanded, reference shall be had to the number of votes to which each member is entitled by the regulations of the company.'"—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said the noble Viscount was not quite accurate in his statement of the effect of his Amendment, as certain words now in the section were proposed by it to be repeated. On the general question, he submitted that it was rather a large and undue burden to place upon those who had the management of a company that they should secure a three-fourths majority at the subsequent meeting. He thought that if a resolution was once carried by three-fourths of those entitled to vote at the first meeting, it was sufficient that it should be subsequently confirmed by a bare majority. Considering the extreme difficulty of getting together three-fourths of a body of one way of thinking, it would be placing too large a power in the hands of a relatively speaking small minority to adopt the Amendment.

Viscount RIDLEY said that if the Amendment had any other effect than that which he had stated it was entirely unintentional, and due to a mistake in copying. There was no intention on his part to make any change except the one to which he had referred.

Lord AVEBURY said he had had to do with a great number of cases where these special resolutions had been passed, and had heard no complaint of the present law. It had worked in a manner satisfactory to all concerned, and he saw no reason why it should now be altered.

*The Earl of GRANARD stated that the view of the Board of Trade had been admirably expressed by Lord Avebury. There had been no complaint of the working of the section as it stood. Indeed petitions had been received at the Board of Trade asking that the necessity for a majority at the confirmatory meeting should be abolished altogether. The noble Viscount appeared to be alone in wishing to make these special resolutions more difficult.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clauses 28 to 31 agreed to.

Clause 32 :—

*The Earl of GRANARD said this clause gave the Court jurisdiction in regard to the making of an order staying the dissolution of a company, and the object of the Amendment standing in his name was to secure that an office copy of the order made should be filed with the registrar, so that the information should be thereby given of the fact to anyone searching the file.

Amendment moved—

"In page 17, line 5, after the word 'dissolved' to insert as a new sub-section: '(3) It shall be the duty of the person on whose application the order was made, within seven days after the making of the order, to file with the registrar an office copy of the order, and if such person fails to do so he shall be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding five pounds for every day during which the default continues.' "—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 32, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 33 and 34 agreed to.

Clause 35 :—

*The Earl of GRANARD said he moved the next Amendment with the object of making it perfectly clear that when a director had not the qualifications laid down by the Act of 1900 he would be liable to a penalty of £5 for every single day up to the last day on which he attended a Board meeting or otherwise acted as a director.

Amendment moved—

"In page 17, line 33, to leave out from the word 'person' to the end of the clause, and to insert the words 'acts as a director of the company he shall be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding five pounds for every day between the expiration of the said period or shorter time and the last day on which it is proved that he acted as a director.' "—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 35, as amended, agreed to.

Viscount RIDLEY moved to insert a new clause to provide that no director might vote or take part in any matter or dealing of any kind with or affecting any other businessor company in which he was interested or concerned unless the fullest disclosure was made in writing of his interest or connection. This was a case in which they were all desirous of defeating wrong-doers, but they felt the difficulty of doing that effectively without unduly hampering legitimate business. But there had been cases of inter-dealings with other companies which had led to serious disclosures. His Amendment merely provided for the setting out in writing of the director's interest, and was not one which in any way hampered legitimate business.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 35, to insert the following new clause, 'No director may vote or take part in any matter or dealing of any kind soever with or affecting any other business or company in which he is interested or concerned unless the fullest disclosure is made in writing of his interest or connection.' "—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said there was no doubt whatever that the principle which animated the noble Viscount was a perfectly right one, but his noble friend ignored the extent to which the law already recognised the propriety of this rule. If a director were interested in a contract with his company, no matter whether it was a fair or an unfair one, for the law would not allow the question to be investigated, the mere fact that he had such an interest was sufficient in itself to enable the company to annul the contract, or, if they liked, to sue him for misfeasance. The thing which the noble Viscount sought to prohibit by his Amendment was void as it was. If a director made a contract in which he himself was interested the transaction was void in law.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Clause 36 agreed to.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said there was an old Act of the Scots Parliament which had been held to invalidate what were known as bearer bonds. The new clause, the insertion of which he now rose to move, adopted the recommendation of the Incorporated Law Society of Scotland confirmed by the Report of the Committee of June last. There were some companies in Scotland which had issued bonds to bearer. That being so, it was obviously beyond all doubt that the old Act of the Scots Parliament should not stand in the way of the acknowledgment of their validity.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 36, to insert the following new clause, 'Notwithstanding anything contained in the statute of the Scots Parliament of 1696, cap. 25, debentures to bearer issued in Scotland are declared to be valid and binding according to their terms.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

*THE EARL OF GRANARD accepted the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 37 :—

*THE EARL OF GRANARD moved an Amendment providing that a private company, in turning itself into a public company, in addition to the requirements specified in the clause, should file with the registrar "such a statement as the company, if a public company, would, under the provisions of Section 6 of the Companies Act, 1900, have had to file before commencing business." The object of the Amendment was to prevent a public company evading the requirements of the Act of 1900.

Amendment moved—

"In page 19, line 25, after the word 'debentures,' to insert the words 'together with such a statement as the company if a public company would, under the provisions of Section 6 of the Companies Act, 1900, have had to file before commencing business.'"—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 37, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 38 agreed to.

Clause 39 :—

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH moved the insertion of a proviso to the effect that no preference or special privilege attached to or belonging to any class of shares should be interfered with except by a special resolution passed and confirmed by shareholders of that class independently of the presence or votes of any shareholders of any other class, and every resolution so passed should be a valid special resolution binding all shareholders of such class. This seemed to him so obviously just that he had every hope that his Amendment would be accepted.

Amendment moved—

"In page 20, line 5, after the word 'classes,' to insert the words 'but provided always that no preference or special privilege attached to or belonging to any class of shares shall be interfered with except by a special resolution passed and confirmed by shareholders of that class independently of the presence or votes of any shareholders of any other class, and every resolution so passed shall be a valid special resolution, binding all shareholders of such class.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said the Government regarded the Amendment as a great improvement of the clause, and gladly accepted it.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said the object of his new subsection was to secure that, when an order was made sanctioning a reorganisation of capital, an office copy of the transaction should be filed.

Amendment moved—

"In page 20, line 5, after the word 'classes' to insert as a new subsection: '(2) Where an order is made under this section an office copy thereof shall be filed with the registrar within seven days after the making of the order, and if default is made in compliance with this provision the company, and every director, manager, secretary, or other officer of the company who is knowingly a party to the default, shall on conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding five pounds for every day during which the default continues.' "—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to

Clause 39, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 40 agreed to.

Clause 41 :—

Drafting Amendment agreed to.

THE EARL OF GRANARD moved an Amendment providing that a receiver or manager of the property of a company shall, on ceasing to act as such receiver or manager, file with the registrar notice to that effect, which notice shall be entered by the registrar on the register of mortgages and charges. The object was to secure that the information on the registrar's file should be as complete as possible.

Amendment moved—

"In page 20, line 17, after the word 'relates' to insert the words 'and shall also, on ceasing to act as such receiver or manager, file with the registrar notice to that effect, which notice shall be entered by the registrar on the register of mortgages and charges.' "—(*The Earl of Granard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 41, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 42 :—

LORD BARNARD moved an Amendment providing that a licence granted by the Board of Trade under Section 23 of the Companies Act, 1867, might at any time be revoked by the Board of Trade if the Board was satisfied that the conditions and regulations under which such licence was granted or held had not been observed. This was a totally different matter from the commercial questions which had hitherto occupied their Lordship's attention. Under Section 23 of the Companies Act, 1867, any association about to be formed which could prove to the Board of Trade that its object was to promote commerce, art, science, religion, or charity, and that its profits were to be applied in promotion of those objects, and, further, that it strictly prohibited dividends, might obtain from the Board of Trade a licence to omit the word "Limited" from its title and yet enjoy all the advantages of a limited company. Many such associations had been formed, and had received the sanction of the Board of Trade to omit the word "Limited," from their title. When this clause —Clause 42—first appeared in the Bill now before their Lordships, enacting that a licence granted by the Board of Trade under 30 and 31 Vict., c. 131, s. 23, might at any time be revoked, many persons interested in these associations became alarmed, and brought the matter to his notice. He then stated that he had very little doubt that the clause was put into the Bill as the result of a recommendation of the Departmental Committee which presented its Report in June of last year, and upon whose recommendations the Bill was founded. But he had since looked carefully at the Report, and had not been able to find any reference to the matter. Therefore, he and his friends were entirely in the dark as to the reason why the clause was inserted. If the clause in its present form passed into law the result would be that the Board of Trade would be able to deprive these bodies of the exemptions and privileges granted by the section to which he had referred, without giving the persons concerned any opportunity of being heard.

Amendment moved—

"In page 20, line 23, after the word 'may' to insert the words 'if the Board is satisfied that the conditions and regulations under which such licence was granted or is' held have not been observed.' "—(*Lord Barnard*).

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said he was very jealous of giving any company, although it might be called charitable or non-commercial, exemption in this matter. He did not see why an association, even if formed for purposes not of gain, should not be required to enter the word "Limited" at the end of the name of the company. Attempts had been made to carry the privilege given under Section 23 of the Act of 1867 very far. Indeed, when he was Attorney-General he was asked whether a golf club might not be permitted to dispense with the word "Limited" on the ground that it was not a money-making concern. The clause in the Bill proposed that the licence granted by the Board of Trade according this privilege might at any time be revoked at the discretion of the Board of Trade, and he did not see why this general discretion should not be given to the Board. The privilege in question had been granted by the Board of Trade, and he failed to see why the parents of the privilege should not be empowered to destroy their offspring if they so wished.

*THE LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY said this clause touched a number of Church Associations, including a very important one in Salisbury — "The Diocesan Board of Finance," and similar Trusts in other Dioceses. At the foundation of their own Board they took the best advice, that of the late Earl of Selborne. If the word "limited" were added to the title of that association they would at once be asked what they were doing with their profits, because he presumed that the addition of "limited" was only reasonable in cases where there was a profit or loss. Under their articles of association there could be neither profit nor loss, and, therefore, he could not see the advisability of adding to their title. He did not think there was any reason to suspect that the Board of Trade would be anxious to withdraw this privilege from them, but it was a real privilege, and if it were proposed to take it away the association should have an opportunity of being heard in opposition to such revocation. The Lord Chancellor had spoken as if he had a strong feeling in the matter. Was not that rather an indication that there might be a movement in the direction of a general sweep of such companies, so as to bring them all into the same net? Speaking for the Salisbury Board of Finance he could say that they would not have the slightest objection to sending in their accounts annually, but they did not wish to be called a limited company.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said that although the Government could not accept the Amendment now before the House, they had no objection to the second Amendment standing in the name of Lord Barnard, which provided that, before the revocation of a licence granted by the Board of Trade to charitable associations or non-commercial companies to dispense with the use of the word "Limited," the Department should give notice in writing of its intention to revoke the licence, and afford the association or company opportunity of being heard in opposition to the revocation.

LORD BARNARD said he would be glad to accept that concession and would withdraw the Amendment now before the Committee.

Amendment, by leave of the Committee, withdrawn.

Amendment moved—

"In page 20, line 27, after the word 'section' to insert the words, 'Before any such licence is revoked under this section the Board of Trade shall give notice in writing of their intention to the company, and shall afford the company an opportunity of being heard in opposition to such revocation.' "—(*Lord Barnard.*)

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clause 42, as amended, agreed to.

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said the insertion of the new Clause which he now moved was desired by the Colonial Office and by the Commonwealth of Australia.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 42, to insert, the following new clause: 'For removing doubts it is hereby declared that the Commonwealth of Australia is a colony within the meaning of the Companies (Colonial Registers) Act, 1883.' "—(*The Earl of Granard*).

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY moved a new clause providing that one-tenth of the shareholders might apply to the Board of Trade to have an investigation of the company. He explained that the object of his Amendment was to make it easier, in case of wrongdoing by directors, to get the Board of Trade to move. At present the provisions of Sections 56 and 57 of the Companies Act, 1862, provided under different circumstances for a proportion of not less than one-fifth of the whole number of persons concerned and registered on the list of the company as members being able to apply to the Board of Trade to have an investigation into the affairs of the company. His Amendment was designed to alter the proportion from one-fifth to one-tenth. During the past forty or fifty years the Board of Trade had only been put into motion by one-fifth of the body of shareholders on four or five occasions. Therefore the small change proposed in his Amendment was not likely to throw any serious increase of work on the Board of Trade.

Amendment moved—

" After Clause 42, to insert the following new clause: 'Section fifty-six, subsection two, of the Companies Act, 1862, shall be read and construed as if the words therein " one-fifth part " had been " one-tenth part." "—(*Viscount Ridley*).

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said the Act of 1862 made the proportion one-fifth of the whole body of those concerned. It was not advisable that small minorities should be constantly worrying. But the Government were willing to consider the matter if practical business men assured them one-fifth was too large a proportion to expect.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY replied that practical business men had assured him that one-fifth was too large.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR: If the noble Viscount will take it at his peril as to what may happen here or elsewhere, I will accept the Amendment.

On Question, Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 43 and 44 agreed to.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY moved the insertion of a new clause to provide that any condition requiring or binding any shareholder to waive compliance with any of the requirements of this Act should be void. He was assured that there were companies who inserted into their articles a provision that certain sections of the Companies Act should not be held binding upon the company. He was not quite certain what the legal position was or whether it was necessary that his proposed new clause should be put into the Bill. But he felt that the Committee would be especially anxious that no clause which was enacted in the Bill should be evaded. He moved his Amendment in order to make the matter absolutely clear.

Amendment moved—

" After Clause 44, to insert the following new clause: 'Any condition requiring or binding any shareholder to waive compliance with any of the requirements of this Act shall be void.' "—(*Viscount Ridley.*)

*THE EARL OF GRANARD said the provision in the Act of 1900, to the effect that any condition requiring or binding any applicant for shares or debentures to waive compliance with the requirements of the Act as to applications should be void, covered the point, and the noble Viscount's clause was, therefore, unnecessary.

VISCOUNT RIDLEY thought there was a doubt as to whether the point was covered.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said the words which his noble friend Lord Granard had quoted were in Section 4 of the Companies Act, 1900, which dealt with the allotment of shares and the conditions affecting their allotment; that was to say, it dealt with the creation of the contract between the shareholders and the company. No individual person could waive a breach of the general law; the only thing that could be waived was what arose out of the contract between the shareholder and the company, and that was provided against. He thought it would be dangerous to use such wide language as that proposed by the noble Viscount. From long experience he dreaded these dangerously wide clauses, because they might have unforeseen consequences.

Amendment, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Clause 45 agreed to.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said he had been in communication with others concerning clauses in this Bill, and the Amendment which he had placed on the Paper was inserted at the instance of those who knew more about these matters than he did. He understood, from a letter he had received from the noble Earl who represented the Board of Trade, that Subsections (1), (3), and (5), in his Amendment were not necessary inasmuch as they were already incorporated in the same words in the Act of 1900, and were not repealed by this Bill. If the noble and learned Lord the Lord Chancellor confirmed that view he would not, of course, persist in those three subsections. But Subsections (2) and (4) seemed to stand on a rather different basis. As regarded Subsection (2), there was a desire to deal with the local official, who was easily accessible and could be interviewed if necessary, rather than with the Board of Trade situated in London. He was sure the Board of Trade would understand that this implied no mistrust of them, but it was more convenient in matters of this kind to have a local official with whom they could deal. Section 41, which he proposed in Subsection (4) of his Amendment should not apply to Scotland, dealt only with matters under the Companies (Winding-up) Acts of 1890 and 1893, which were English and not Scottish Acts. It was quite clear, therefore, that Section 41 should not apply to Scotland, and he thought it more convenient that it should be so stated on the face of the Bill.

Amendment moved—

"After Clause 45, to insert the following new clause: 'In the application of this Act to Scotland. (1) "Solicitor of the High Court" shall mean enrolled law agent; (2) Where the words "Board of Trade" occur in section 10 (2) and (3) the words "Accountant of Court" shall be read in lieu thereof; (3) The provisions of this Act with respect to the registration of mortgages and charges shall not apply to companies registered in Scotland; (4) Section 41 shall not apply to Scotland; (5) All prosecutions for offences or fines shall be at the instance of the Lord Advocate or a Procurator Fiscal as the Lord Advocate may direct.'"—(*Lord Balfour of Burleigh.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said he was prepared to accept Subsections (1) and (5). With regard to Subsection (2), the Board of Trade already had authority in Scotland, and it seemed to be desirable that there should be some uniform rule, which could only be secured by having the same authority in different parts of the Kingdom. With regard to Subsection (3) he thought it was desirable that information concerning mortgages and charges should be made public in every part of the Kingdom. He was not aware that Scottish opinion was against it. With regard to Subsection (4), he thought that Section 41 ought to apply in Scotland as well as in England. There was no reason why there should be any diversity in practice, unless any special case could be shown.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH said he would for the present be satisfied with the first and last subsections, and would delete Subsections (2), (3), and (4) from his Amendment.

On Question, Amendment, as amended, agreed to.

Remaining clause agreed to.

Standing Committee negatived: The Report of Amendments to be received on Tuesday, the 14th instant; and Bill to be printed as amended. (No. 50.)

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Seven o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter before Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 2nd May, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before Three of the Clock.

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the Borough of Tower Hamlets (Stepney Division), in the room of Sir William Eden Evans-Gordon (Chiltern Hundreds):—(*Sir Alexander Acland-Hood.*)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Worthing Gas Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Bristol Corporation Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Great Central Railway Bill. Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 5).

Sir LEWIS McIVER reported from the Committee on Group 5 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY BILLS (GROUP 2).

Mr. SOAMES reported from the Committee on Group 2 of Railway Bills; That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Monday next, at Two of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for amending certain provisions of the Birmingham Corporation Water Acts in regard to repayment of moneys borrowed for the purpose of those Acts, and for other purposes." Birmingham Corporation Water Bill [Lords.]

Birmingham Corporation Water Bill [Lords], read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

BUTTER AND MARGARINE BILL.

Petition of the Royal Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION ACTS (AMENDMENT) BILL.

Petition of the Royal Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION BILL.

Petition of the Royal Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Anniesland and Jordanhill; Breadalbane; Camelon; Glasgow; Partick; and Whiteinch; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

Petition of the Royal Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

PUBLIC HEALTH (REGULATIONS AS TO FOOD) BILL.

Petition of the Royal Sanitary Institute, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

Petition from Kidderminster, for prohibition; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES.

Return [presented 1st May] to be printed. [No. 136.]

ARTERIAL DRAINAGE COMMISSION (IRELAND.)

Copy presented, of Appendix to the Report of the Viceregal Commission on Arterial Drainage in Ireland, with Minutes of Proceedings, Evidence, and Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the City of Manchester and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within a certain part of the City [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES.)

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3770 to 3772 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TREATY SERIES (No. 12, 1907.)

Copy presented, of Exchange of Notes between the United Kingdom and Germany, respecting the Estates of Deceased Seamen, 16th February, 21st March, 1907 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SHOP HOURS ACT, 1904 (CLOSING ORDERS.)

Address for "Return showing separately for England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, to the 31st day of March, 1907, the number of Closing Orders made by local authorities under the Shop Hours Act, 1904, and submitted to the central authority for confirmation; the number of such Orders confirmed, (a) with amendments, and (b) without amendments; and the number of such Orders subsequently revoked upon application of the local authority."—(*Mr. Crooks.*)

EAST INDIA FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

Address for "Return of the Indian Financial Statement for 1907–8 and of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council of the Governor-General thereon."—(*Sir Henry Fowler.*)

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE (ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND.)

Return ordered, "showing, for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1907, the amount contributed by England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively, to the Revenue collected by Imperial officers; the Expenditure on English, Scottish, and Irish Services met out of such Revenue, and the balances of Revenue contributed by England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively, which are available for Imperial Expenditure (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 278, of Session 1906).—(*Mr. John O'Connor.*)

HARBOUR, &c., BILLS (BURNHAM (SOMERSET) PIER BILL.)

Copy ordered, "of the Report of the Board of Trade on the Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill."—(*Mr. Lloyd-George.*)

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Portsmouth Dockyard Labourers' Pay.

MR. BRAMSDON (Portsmouth): To ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that the contractors working for the Admiralty in Portsmouth Dockyard pay their labourers at the rate of about 4½d. per hour, and that such employment is precarious; that the standard rate of wages for similar work in the neighbourhood is 6d. per hour; and whether he will take steps to arrange that the standard rate of wages shall be paid.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) I have made inquiries, and find that none of the firms to whom I understand my hon. friend alludes have carried out any work in Portsmouth Dockyard since the beginning of the year.

Keyham and Devonport Bricklayers' Pay.

SIR JOHN BENN (Devonport): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the bricklayers employed under the Director of Works Department at Keyham and Devonport Dockyards at 31s. 6d. per week are doing similar work to those employed at Portsmouth and Chatham at 34s.; and, if so, will he recommend an advance of wages for such men as are underpaid.

(*Answered by Mr. Edmund Robertson.*) Works Department rates are governed by the rate of wages current in the district. These rates are higher at Chatham and Portsmouth than at Devonport.

Rockchapel Mails.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether the postal authorities are aware that the delivery of the mails on the 4th, 5th, and 6th, at Rockchapel, county Cork, was nearly one hour late on each day; that correspondents in this district were unable to answer letters received on the 6th until the 9th owing to the irregular delivery and to the fact that there is no Sunday mail; whether steps will be taken to prevent a recurrence of these irregularities; and whether, in view of the many complaints of the residents respecting unsatisfactory postal service, the postal authorities will now consider the advisability of despatching the mails to Rockchapel viâ Newmarket, a railway station town about nine miles distant, instead of viâ Abbeyfeale, county Limerick, and Brosna, county Kerry, an extra mileage of forty to fifty, as at present.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am making inquiry on the subject and will acquaint the hon. Member with the result.

Post Office Annuitants.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): To ask the Postmaster General whether Post Office annuitants who require to draw on their capital are permitted to arrange with the Post Office to compound for their annuity according to the common practice of other annuity offices, and what instructions are given to local postmasters with a view to such arrangements.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The Acts which provide for the payment of Government annuities through the Post Office do not provide any systematic arrangement for the compounding of annuities which are in course of payment. The Postmaster General, with the consent of the National Debt Commissioners, may cancel a contract for the purchase of an annuity. In the case of a deferred annuity purchased under the money returnable system, the purchase-money would be returned, without interest, if application were made to the Controller of the Savings Bank at any time before the annuity came into course of payment.

Crouch End Telephone Exchange.

CAPTAIN BALFOUR (Middlesex, Hornsey): To ask the Postmaster-General if he can give any probable date for the opening of the post office telephone exchange at Crouch End.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The exchange building will be completed at the end of the present month and the installation of the switch board and exchange plant will be carried out as soon as possible. It is hoped that the exchange will be opened in November. Five call offices have been opened in the district and others will be opened shortly.

Board of Trade and the Railway Companies.

MR. HOOPER (Dudley): To ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the arrangements referred to in the published correspondence between the Board of Trade and the Railway Companies' Association are recorded in any minutes relating to the conferences of goods managers at their clearing house or elsewhere, and, if so, whether he will obtain a copy for the information of the House; and if he will ascertain if such arrangements affect the question of railway rates directly or indirectly, apart from the question of rebates, and whether foreign merchandise, imported from the Continent, is specially exempted from the arrangements referred to in the published correspondence.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) The Board of Trade are in correspondence with the railway companies in this matter, and my right hon. friend will communicate with the hon. Member as soon as possible.

London Motor Omnibuses.

MR. CLAUDE HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that drivers of motor omnibuses in London frequently, without reasonable cause, refuse to stop or even slacken speed for intending passengers; and whether he will cause the police to communicate with the owners to ensure that the convenience of the public may be properly considered in this respect.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Complaints of this nature have been made to the Commissioner of Police, and he has already called the attention of the omnibus companies to the inconvenience caused to the public. I believe that improvement has resulted.

Kilindini Harbour, East Africa.

SIR CLEMENT HILL (Shrewsbury): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what progress has been made towards the improvement of the harbour facilities at Kilindini, in the East Africa Protectorate.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) The Secretary of State has received no special official Report as to the progress which has been made; but it is believed that the work is proceeding satisfactorily.

Game Protection in East Africa and Uganda.

SIR CLEMENT HILL: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, what sums have been taken, in the Estimates of the current year, towards the protection of game animals in the East Africa and Uganda Protectorates, respectively; what staff will be apportioned to either protectorate, and how soon the members will be appointed; and where it is proposed that the various officers should be stationed.

(*Answered by Mr. Churchill.*) A sum of £2,370 for the preservation of game has been provided in the Estimates of the East Africa Protectorate for the current year. The rangers, whose salaries are to be paid from this sum, will all be stationed in the East Africa Protectorate, and they will be appointed as soon as possible. I am unable to say where they will be stationed. With regard to the Uganda Protectorate no provision has been made in the Estimates for the current year for the preservation of game, and I would refer the hon. Member to the despatch from the late Commissioner of the 1st of November, 1905, which is printed in the Parliamentary Paper [Cd. 3189]. In that despatch Colonel Hayes-Sadler said that it would not be possible to police the Uganda reserves without incurring expense, which, under the circumstances, he did not consider justified, the sanctity of the reserves being fully respected as it is.

Irish Treasury Savings.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state how much money did the Treasury save out of the Irish Votes that were not expended since 1903; whether he can state the amounts saved on the different Votes, and to what purpose the money so saved has been applied.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The sums surrendered on the annual Votes of Parliament are shown each year in the Appropriation Accounts. The inquiry as to the application of moneys so saved appears to be based on a misapprehension. A saving on a Vote of Parliament does not necessarily mean that any money is made available for expenditure on other purposes; it only means that the expenditure out of that particular Vote has been less than it was estimated to be. In so far as, owing to savings on the Votes generally and to other causes, the Exchequer Revenue exceeds the Exchequer Issues for the year, the balance is applied under statute to the reduction of Debt as Old Sinking Fund.

Land Act Guarantee Fund.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.): To ask the Secretary of the Treasury, if he will set out in quarterly periods, from the 1st November, 1903, to the present time, the sums drawn under the Land Act of 1903 from the guarantee fund for the whole of Ireland, in order to show the growth of these losses.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The following statement shows the sums drawn from and repaid to the guarantee fund under the Irish Land Act, 1903, for each quarter from 1st November, 1903:—

Quarter ended.	Arrears of Annuities and deficiency of Income.			Drawn for excess stock.	Total. Drawn (+), Repaid (−).
	Drawn.	Repaid.	Net amount drawn (+) or repaid (−).		
	£	£	£	£	£
31st December, 1903 -	—	—	—	—	—
31st March, 1904 -	—	—	—	—	—
30th June, 1904 - -	—	—	—	9,910	+ 9,910
30th September, 1904 -	—	—	—	—	—
31st December, 1904 -	—	—	—	9,908	+ 9,908
31st March, 1905 -	787	262	+ 525	—	+ 525
30th June, 1905 -	—	190	− 190	19,350	+ 19,160
30th September, 1905 -	10,395	151	+ 10,244	—	+ 10,244
31st December, 1905 -	—	4,400	− 4,400	19,349	+ 14,949
31st March, 1906 -	10,523	11,361	− 838	—	− 838
30th June, 1906 -	—	3,859	− 3,859	22,661	+ 18,802
30th September, 1906 -	7,478	970	+ 6,508	—	+ 6,508
31st December, 1906 -	10,969	4,560	+ 6,409	35,130	+ 41,539
31st March, 1907 -	59,328	5,440	+ 53,888	—	+ 53,888
	99,480	31,193	+ 68,287	116,308	+ 184,595

The above table includes the amounts drawn from the development grant in respect of excess stock.

The £68,287 drawn from Death Duty, etc., grants is less than the amount given in answer to the hon. Member on 22nd[†] ultimo by £2,709, the arrears repaid to the guaranteed fund after 31st January, 1907.

Land Act Treasury Rules.

Mr. GINNELL: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury will the amendments which he proposes to make in the Treasury Rules under the Land Act of 1903 restore inspection for value in every case, segregate the value of the tenant-right or occupation interest and improvements, and restrict the price to the value of the raw material, which is the only thing that belongs to the landlord; or will they in any way secure either the purchasers or the ratepayers against the losses consequent upon the present system of paying money irrespective of value.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 1374–5.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The Answer to both parts of the Question is in the negative.

Land Act Stock.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.) To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state the total amount of stock issued up to the 31st March last, for the purposes of the Irish Land Act, 1903; the total cost of its flotation; the annual liability of the Irish Development Grant Fund in respect of the same; and the present capital liability of that fund.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) The total amount of Guaranteed 2¾ per cent. Stock issued to 31st March, 1907, has been—

	£	s.	d.
For the purposes of advances - -	19,300,000	0	0
For the purpose of the Land Purchase Aid Fund - - -	1,901,444	8	9
	£21,201,444	8	9

The total amount of the expenses incurred in the issue of the above stock has been £42,616 14s. 9d. The annual liability of the Ireland Development Grant is limited to an annuity of 3¼ per cent. on the excess stock issued in respect of advances. This annuity at present amounts to £70,253. The present capital liability to be made good from the Ireland Development Grant amounts to £2,143,031.

Irish Development Grant and Irish Land Purchase.

MR. MOONEY (Newry): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will state in detail how the sum of £102,000 paid from the Irish Development Grant to the income account of the Irish Land Purchase Fund has been expended.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman*) The sum of £102,000 has been used in making good the deficiencies on the income account of the Irish Land Purchase Fund up to 31st March, 1906. These deficiencies have been due to—

	£
Unearned dividend on issues of stock - - - -	63,200
Advance dividend - - -	19,900
Unproductive balances, etc. -	18,900

Scottish Small Holdings.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will state the quantity of land, in statute acres, acquired by the Congested Districts Board for Scotland and by the Crofters Commission from the formation of those bodies down to the date of their last Reports; the number of holdings enlarged, improved, or enhanced, and the number of new holdings formed therefrom; and the quantity of this land, if any, remaining undistributed at the date mentioned; also similar information, so far as available, regarding land not acquired by those bodies but distributed with their financial or other help or co-operation.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The Crofters Commission have no power under the Act to purchase or otherwise acquire land or to form new holdings, but they are authorised, under Sections 11, 12, and 13, to assign land on application made in enlargement of existing crofters' holdings. In carrying out these provisions, they have assigned 53,187 acres, in enlargement of 1,352 crofters' holdings from the passing of the Act in 1886 to 31st December, 1906. The quantity of land in statute acres purchased by the Congested Districts Board is 80,476 acres, of which a little over 20,000 acres of farm land are undistributed at this date. The number of holdings enlarged, improved, or enhanced on these properties up to this date is 222. The number of new holdings formed therefrom up to this date is eighty-eight. On lands which still belong to other proprietors 360 new holdings have been formed with the help of the Board, and enlargements have, with their help, been given to 237 tenants of these proprietors. The quantity of land involved in the formation of these new holdings and enlargements is about 37,000 acres.

Horse Breeding in Scotland.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): To ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he is aware that the Congested Districts Board are still selecting stallions for service in districts under their control which have not undergone a veterinary inspection, and that in consequence not infrequently horses are employed which are unsuitable and unfit, even that such have been sometimes found travelling the country actually lame; what steps does he suggest to prevent such occurrences; and whether he will issue instructions that every horse shall be subjected to veterinary examination before final approval.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) I am informed that, of the five stallions selected for service on the suggestion of people locally interested, one has been certified by a veterinary surgeon, and certificates will be obtained for the others before final approval.

Cambridge Cottage, Kew.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he would say for what purpose the Department intend the house known as Cambridge Cottage, Kew, after the furnishing of the same is completed.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The eastern and central sections of the buildings will be used for museum purposes, and the remaining portion will be converted into four houses for members of the staff of the gardens.

Kew Gardens Guides.

MR. SUMMERBELL: To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he is aware that the right to sell the Kew Handlist guides, postcards, etc., has been given to a private firm; and, if so, would he state the reason for such transference, and the price paid for the privilege by the said firm.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The right to sell guide books, post cards, etc., at Kew has been given to a private firm in order that the staff of the gardens may be relieved of a task which interfered with the performance of their proper duties, and that improved facilities may be given to visitors for the purchase of publications likely to be of interest to them. The firm in question will bear the cost of erecting a suitable store and saleroom, and pay a rent of £5 per annum for the first two years, and £10 per annum for the next three years.

Nantwich Postmaster's Relatives.

MR. DUNCAN SCHWANN (Cheshire, Hyde): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will explain why the rule of the service that the relatives of postmasters cannot receive appointment at the same office has been departed from at the Nantwich post office; and, in view of the friction caused by the non-observance of the rule, he will direct that it be adhered to in this instance.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) There is no rule prohibiting the appointment at any particular office of a relative, male or female, of the postmaster of that office. It is usual to require male relatives to be transferred elsewhere on attaining the age of nineteen, but female relatives are not disturbed unless the relationship is found to be detrimental to the efficiency of the service.

Robertstown Mail Service.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that at the present time a mid-day mail arrives at Robertstown, county Kildare, and whether notice of discontinuance of the same has been issued; if so, what is the reason for such discontinuance; and will he withdraw the order if it be shown that the existing arrangement is a convenience to many of the inhabitants.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I have called for a Report on this subject, and on its receipt I will send the hon. Member a reply.

Motherwell Licensing Case.

MR. FINDLAY (Lanarkshire, N.E.): To ask the Lord-Advocate whether his attention has been drawn to the case of the Cross Keys public house in Motherwell, the certificate for which was in the name of Alfred Ernest Howard, and to the fact that the said certificate holder had granted a trust deed for behoof of his creditors on or about the month of November of last year, that no transfer of the said certificate to his trustees had been applied for, but that notwithstanding the business had been carried on without interruption up to this date; and whether, in these circumstances and in view of the provisions of the Licensing (Scotland) Act, 1903, he will explain why no action has been taken by the responsible authorities for this breach of the law.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) I have directed inquiries to be made both locally and in regard to the general practice in cases such as those alluded to in the Question, and I shall be glad to answer a further Question upon the subject next week.

Boards of Guardians and the Workmen's Compensation Rule.

MR. SUMMERBELL: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he intends to issue a circular letter to boards of guardians and other local authorities, stating the Local Government Board's views as to what liabilities the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1906, places on such authorities; and what classes of officers stand in the relation of workmen within the meaning of the Act to such authorities.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The Local Government Board have no power to determine what class of officers stand in the relation of workmen within the meaning of the Act to local authorities; but I propose to issue a circular drawing attention to its provisions.

Ipswich Union Labour Yard.

MR. SUMMERBELL: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether the Local Government Board had urged the Ipswich Board of Guardians to close their outdoor labour yard; and, if so, whether the Local Government Board had suggested, or would suggest, to the Ipswich guardians any other method of providing work for the unemployed who were destitute of means to maintain themselves and their families; and whether the men working in the labour yard had any children, the number and ages of the children, and whether he had advised, or would advise, the guardians to make any provision for such children.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) The object of opening a labour yard is not to provide work for the unemployed, but to enable the guardians to set able-bodied men to work as a condition of their receiving outdoor relief. A labour yard should not be relied upon as affording a constant means of subsistence. After the winter was over the Local Government Board asked the Ipswich guardians to close the labour yard which they had opened in December last, and this the guardians have done. I have not before me information as to the number and ages of any children of the persons who worked in the labour yard. If any destitute able-bodied male person now applies to the guardians for relief he must be relieved in the workhouse, with such of his family as may be resident with him, unless in a special case the guardians depart from the requirements of the regulations on the subject and the Board assent to their doing so.

Newark Guardians' Relief Work Pay.

MR. SUMMERBELL: To ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the Local Government Board inspector advised the Newark guardians not to pay able-bodied men who were needing employment as much as 2s. for a day's work, and said that it had been found in other unions that by giving men five days work, and by relieving them according to their necessities, there was a decrease in applications, because it was found that it was not worth their while to work for five days, say, for 7s. a week; will he say in what unions men had been offered 7s. a week or less for five days work; whether all the men were single men, or whether any of them had a wife, child, or children; and whether the Local Government Board approved of their inspector's statement.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) My hon. friend only gave notice of his Question yesterday, and hence I have not been able to communicate with the inspector with regard to the matter referred to in it, or to ascertain the precise unions to which he is stated to have alluded in his interview with the Newark guardians. I have, however, seen a newspaper report of the interview, and, if this account is correct, I should see no reason to disapprove of the advice which he gave. I would point out that the relief given by guardians to an able-bodied male person is not a payment for work done, but should be based upon the necessities of the man and those dependent on him. The work is intended as a condition of the relief and a test of destitution.

Government Lunacy Grant.

MR. W. PEARCE (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): To ask the President of the Local Government Board, if he will introduce legislation extending the grant of 4s. weekly now made under the Local Government Act, 1888, in respect of each lunatic maintained in a lunatic asylum, to imbeciles and lunatics certified for treatment in workhouses.

(*Answered by Mr. John Burns.*) Some extension of the grant in the direction desired was recommended by the Royal Commission on Local Taxation, subject to certain conditions. The matter will receive consideration when the question of local taxation is dealt with by the Government; but I could not promise to introduce legislation with regard to it at the present time.

Probate and Estate Duty Valuations.

MR. GINNELL: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state how the Treasury is secured against fraud in the numerous cases in which the Commissioners of Inland Revenue and Probate Court officials discourage the making of valuations for probate and estate duty by qualified and licensed valuers or auctioneers, and accept instead unchecked guesses or estimates made by unqualified persons who have not seen the property; have cases of abuse of this practice been brought under his notice; do professional valuers and auctioneers pay licence duties; if so, what steps are taken to protect their interests; and can he see his way, in justice to the public, to the revenue, and to those professions, to order the discontinuance of the practice complained of.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) Neither the Board of Inland Revenue nor the Probate Court officials "discourage" professional valuations for estate duty. They merely do not insist on such valuations in cases where the value of property can be sufficiently determined without expert professional advice. The Board are not aware of any abuse of this concession, and it does not seem to them that the fact that auctioneers and valuers have to pay licence duty is a sufficient reason for imposing on accountable parties an obligation to employ them for estate duty purposes where the subject of valuation does not require their assistance.

Irish County Council Bank Accounts.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the name of each county council in Ireland, the name of the bank acting as treasurer, and the rate of interest allowed on credit balances on the current account of each council.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board are in a position to state the names of the banks which act as treasurers to county councils, but have no information as to the special arrangements made by the counties with their treasurers in regard to overdrafts and credit balances. The Board have reason to believe that the publication of these arrangements between the banks and their customers would be objected to, and might lead to a reconsideration of them which would not be to the advantage of the counties in every case.

Irish Law Officers' Fees.

MR. GINNELL: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will supply details of the sum of £7,000 stated in the Civil Service Estimates, Class 3, Vote 14, Sub-head F, to have been spent last year, so that Parliament may know how it has been spent before voting the similar sum asked for this year under the same sub-head.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The hon. Member is mistaken in supposing that the sum of £7,000 is stated to have been spent under the sub-head quoted in the last financial year. That sum was provided in last year's Estimates, but the accounts for the year have not yet been passed. The amount expended will appear in the Appropriation Accounts in due course. The hon. Member will find it stated in the Estimates that the provision under Sub-head F is for—Fees to counsel, other than the Law Officers, for conducting Crown prosecutions, etc., also for representing the Attorney-General on the trial of election petitions. The bulk of the expenditure under this sub-head consists of fees to Crown counsel for conducting the ordinary prosecutions at assizes.

Kiltyclogher Evicted Tenant.

MR. DOLAN (Leitrim, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners are aware that one of their inspectors, Mr. W. H. Todd, has informed Mr. William M'Gowan, Raheelin, Kiltyclogher, county Leitrim, that he can only be reinstated in the holding from which he was evicted by agreeing to pay an annuity equal in amount to the old rent, which he was unable to pay; and what action do the Estates Commissioners purpose taking in the matter.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have inquired into this matter, and have ascertained that their inspector did not make the statement attributed to him. The question of the price at which M'Gowan should purchase if reinstated did not arise, as M'Gowan informed the inspector that he could not live on the holding from which he was evicted, but desired to get land elsewhere. The Commissioners have not yet dealt with their inspector's Report on the case.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

Obsolete Warships.

MR. WATT (Glasgow, College): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Amiralty, whether the obsolete war vessel recently removed from Holy Loch has yet been sold; and, if so, what was the original cost of that vessel, when was she built, and what price has she now brought; whether the remaining vessels in that loch and in the Kyles of Bute are to be removed and sold; and, if so will he say when he proposes to do this.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): I assume that my hon. friend refers to the "Immortalite." As this vessel was sold on a percentage basis, her sale value connot be definitely stated, but the proceeds will not be less than £16,000. She was launched in 1887 and cost £259,527. Two other vessels lying at Holy Loch have recently been sold, and will shortly be removed. The disposal of the remaining vessels is under consideration.

Marine Officers.

MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty at what average age specialisation of marine officers will commence under the new scheme, and by whom will the former subaltern duties of marine officers be performed.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: So far as can be foreseen at present, the average age of specialisation under the scheme will be about 22½. No decision on the point mentioned in the second part of the Question will be required for some years.

Rosyth.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty about what date Rosyth was first considered by the Government of the day as suitable for a naval base; what steps were taken to ascertain its suitability or otherwise; whether any Report together with the evidence taken, was made; and, if so, whether full information will be laid upon the Table of the House.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I understand that Rosyth first came under consideration early in 1902. The adoption of this site was first recommended by the Berthing Committee, and an examination of the land followed. The Berthing Committee took evidence, and their Report was presented to the House (Cd. 1649 of Session 1903). When definite proposals are laid before the House, the question of furnishing additional information will be considered.

MR. C. E. PRICE: Will the evidence be laid with the Report?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I will consider that when any definite proposal is made.

MR. WATT: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether negotiations with the Marquess of Linlithgow began before his return from Australia or afterwards?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: That took place under the late Government, and I cannot say.

SIR GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): May I ask whether the definite proposals will be made during this session?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: That I cannot say.

MR. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether the definite proposals made by the late Government in August, 1905, were made before we knew what the nature of the bottom of the harbour was?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I cannot be expected to answer that Question.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): Has the right hon. Gentleman had time to study the Return as to the bottom of the sea?

MR. C. E. PRICE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether Rosyth was purchased from the Marquess of Linlithgow in one or two lots; when the transaction was completed, the rental derived from the land prior to purchase, the acreage and gross amount paid for it, the conditions of sale as to minerals; and whether it leaves the Government free to quarry for stone for any of the naval works without further payment.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I understand that the property at Rosyth acquired from Lord Linlithgow was purchased in one lot. The purchase of the land and foreshore was completed on the 31st July, 1903; the purchase of minerals was completed on the 18th November, 1903. The rental prior to purchase was £1,288 15s. per annum. The acreage acquired was 911½ acres of land and 236 acres of foreshore. The price paid for the land and foreshore was £100,000, and for the minerals £12,250. The Admiralty have acquired all the minerals on the property, and have full rights of quarrying. Certain adjacent property was acquired at the same time from Mr. Newton, amounting to 266 acres of land and 50 acres of foreshore, at a cost of £22,500 including all mineral rights. This property includes valuable quarries which could be used for the works.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): Can the right hon. Gentleman tell us how many years purchase was paid for this property?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: That is an arithmetical question which the hon. Gentleman is quite competent to solve.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): Were means taken to assess the value of these lands impartially, or did the Department which the right hon. Gentleman represents make the valuation themselves?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON asked for notice of the Question.

Garrison Artillery Militia.

MR. FELL (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how much will be saved by the order that the Garrison Artillery Militia shall this year do their training without the usual supply of gun ammunition.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddington): No money has been taken in the Estimates for ammunition for the Militia Garrison Artillery practice, as sufficient surplus ammunition is available. No saving, therefore, is effected this year. The value of gun ammunition annually expended by this force is about £12,000.

Territorial Force—County Association Funds.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can inform the House if it is intended that the money paid by the Army Council to county associations for the requirements of the Territorial Force shall cover the necessary equipment and maintenance of that force, or what interpretation is to be given to the words all other money received by an association.

MR. HALDANE: It is intended that the money paid by the Army Council to a county association, taken together with arms or other supplies in kind, shall be sufficient to cover the necessary equipment and maintenance of the Territorial Force in its area. The intention of the provision in the Bill relating to other money received by an association is simply to leave to the association a free hand in the disposal of any property (including money) it may receive from private sources, and not to relieve the Government from the obligation to maintain the Territorial Force in the county.

The Indian Budget.

MR. ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can now say on what day the Indian Budget will be taken.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. CHARLES HOBHOUSE, Bristol, E.): As the Secretary of State stated in reply to a Question on Tuesday, he hopes that the discussion will take place during the first week or ten days after the Whitsun holidays.

Assam Children's Education.

MR. HICKS BEACH (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can now state whether it has been found possible to provide additional facilities for the education of children employed on the tea-gardens in Assam and other Indian provinces.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer I gave to a similar Question on the 14th March,[†] to which I have at present nothing to add.

The St. Lucia Riots.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any further official information in regard to the rioting at St. Lucia; what is the total number of killed and wounded; and what steps are being taken to cope with the trouble.

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. CHURCHILL, Manchester, N.W.): The following telegram was received from the Governor on the afternoon of the 30th of April, "30th April, Conditions improved, one factory working, two partly working, one idle, but feeling still acute, no firing since last report, but correct casualty returns rifle fire number of killed is four, wounded twenty-nine, of whom two since dead, other casualties with (?) sticks and stones. No doubt that armed police by firing saved the factories and lives, checked organised massing of three large bodies of rioters and prevented far greater calamity." And on the afternoon of yesterday, the following, "1st May: factories still guarded, conditions unchanged, temper people unsatisfactory: Marines should be landed in place of Barbados police on arrival of 'Indefatigable.'" My Answer to the hon. Members for West Lanarkshire and Mid-Armagh on Monday last[‡] has shown what measures have hitherto been taken to prevent further disturbances. Detachments of police were summoned from Barbados and St. Vincent, and H.M.S. "Indefatigable" was ordered to proceed to St. Lucia, and arrived last night. The Governor has stated that no further assistance is required.

SIR GILBERT PARKER asked whether in view of recent events, the Government would take into consideration the question of greater naval protection for the West Indies.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir; it is being taken into consideration, and I understand some alteration is about to be made.

Unlicensed Chinese Coolies in the Transvaal.

MR. WALSH (Lancashire, Ince): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether another shipment of coolies left China a few days ago with the object of work in the Transvaal mines, including about 250 for whom no licences were issued; and, if so, whether, in view of the promise made in July, 1906, of the arrest of importation before the Transvaal Assembly was established, he will inform the House by whose authority licences are still being issued and recruiting going on, and what system of supervision, if any, exists at the ports of shipment; and whether, seeing that a large number of the last shipment are unlicensed, His Majesty's Government will take steps to prevent their landing at Cape Town or their despatch to the Transvaal mines.

[†] See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 210.

[‡] See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 528–9.

MR. CHURCHILL: The last batch of Chinese coolies reached the Transvaal early in January, since when no further coolies have left or can leave China for South Africa.

MR. WALSH: What was the date at which 250 unlicensed coolies were admitted? Will the correspondence on the subject be laid?

MR. CHURCHILL: It is true that the number of coolies imported in the last shipload was increased by 259. This was due to an error, which caused great annoyance to my noble friend Lord Elgin and also, I suppose, to the authorities in South Africa. The question of the immediate repatriation of these 259 coolies who had been imported without licence was the subject of considerable correspondence between this country and South Africa; but, after careful investigation of the whole circumstances, and in view of the very large expenditure that would have been incurred by chartering a special ship to repatriate 259 coolies, the Secretary of State decided that it would not be possible to persist in the request that we had made to the Governor of the Transvaal to make a special repatriation. The telegrams which passed on the subject are, I think, ripe for publication, and will, I think, show the House the earnest effort we have made to abide in strict detail by all we have said to the House of Commons from time to time, and I will ask my noble friend whether he will not consent to their being laid before the House.

MR. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne): If these coolies had been sent back on whom would the cost have fallen?

MR. CHURCHILL said he presumed that, as the Government had made the mistake in calculation, the cost of repatriation would fall on the Government.

MR. SCOTT: Even if these coolies are not licensed?

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): I presume that these Chinamen will not come under the Ordinance at all?

MR. T. CORBETT (Down, N.): Is the whole future of Chinese labour in the Transvaal not to be left to the new Transvaal Government?

MAJOR SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) asked whether these 259 coolies would be returned with the next shipload.

MR. CHURCHILL hoped the return by shipload would soon be beginning. The ships would be filled with Chinese returning on the expiration of their contract; whether they would include these identical coolies he could not say.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) asked on what date these 259 coolies arrived.

MR. CHURCHILL: It was the last shipload, at whatever date they entered.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Have they been allowed to start work under the conditions of the Ordinance?

MR. CHURCHILL said no objection had been made to the coolies proceeding to work.

Several other hon. Members rose to put questions.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Notice should be given of any further Questions.

Indians in the Transvaal.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford) in accordance with notice given privately, asked whether the Transvaal Registration Bill had been received by His Majesty's Government for approval; whether this Bill was a practical re-enactment of the Asiatic Ordinance passed by the late Legislative Council of the Transvaal, which was disallowed by His Majesty's Government; whether, in view of the protests of the British Indian community, His Majesty's Government would, under the powers reserved to them, advise His Majesty to withhold his sanction from the measure; and whether the Government would represent to the Government of the Transvaal the advisability of accepting the proposals of the British Indian community adopted at a mass meeting at Johannesburg on March 11th, 1907.

MR. CHURCHILL: Yes, Sir. The Law has been received and is, except in a few minor points, identical with the previous Bill. After very careful consideration of this measure from the standpoint of Lord Elgin's despatch of the 29th November published in Cd. 3308, and having regard to the fact that the Law proposed is supported by the unanimous authority of a Parliament newly elected in a responsible self-governing Colony, the Secretary of State has decided to advise His Majesty not to disallow it.

Coolies' Education in Ceylon.

MR. HICKS BEACH: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Government of Ceylon have now drafted an ordinance for extending educational facilities to the children of Indian coolies employed on the plantations in Ceylon.

MR. CHURCHILL: As I informed the hon. Member for North Manchester on Tuesday, the draft Ordinance is under the consideration of the Ceylon Legislature.

Russia and the British Fleet.

MR. THORNE (West Ham, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it is the intention of the Government to send part of the British Fleet to Kronstadt during the second week in May.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Sir EDWARD GREY, Northumberland, Berwick): No, Sir. A rumour which I understand has appeared in the Press to this effect is entirely without foundation. The question has not been raised at all.

Nicaraguan Outrage on the British Flag.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information with regard to the action of an officer of the Nicaraguan Army in cutting down the British flag flying over the house of a British subject, Mr. William Collins, living at Salado; and whether the American Government has been thanked for its friendly action in the matter.

SIR EDWARD GREY: My attention has been called to the account in the Press. I have no other information about the matter, and will make inquiries.

Sanitation in Egypt.

DR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, seeing the state of destitution in which native children are often to be seen in the larger towns of Egypt, he will advise the Egyptian Government to institute homes for neglected children of both sexes.

The hon. Member had also given notice of the following Questions:—

To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to complaints to the effect that in the early part of last year the banks of the Ismailia Canal running through Cairo were infected by exudations from stagnant residue in the canal bed, no steps having been taken to clean out the canal, as had been done in previous years at low Nile; and whether he will advise the Egyptian Government to adopt measures to prevent the recurrence of this danger to the health of the capital.

To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, seeing that the Egyptian towns of Aswan, Kena, Girga, Sohag, Minia, Fayum, Zagazig, Damietta, Mehalet Kebir, Shibin el Kom, Menuf, Zifta, Mit Ghamr, Benha, and Damanhur, with aggregate populations of 346,000, are still wholly or partly dependent on unfiltered Nile water for drinking purposes, he will advise the Egyptian Government to institute an improved system.

To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether there is any system of drainage and sewerage in the villages or towns of Egypt with the exception of Alexandria.

SIR E. GREY: This Question and the three others put by the hon. Member relate to questions of Egyptian internal administration. And, while I have every desire to encourage sanitary reform, I must point out that this is one of the matters which receive constant attention from the Egyptian Government, and that the direct interference of His Majesty's Government in matters of administrative detail is both impracticable and undesirable. As the hon. Member is no doubt aware, the progress of social reform in every country must be gradual, and particular measures must depend upon the resources of the State and the pressure of other claims upon them.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if it is not the case that there is less destitution, both in the adult and infantile population of Egypt, than in most European countries?

SIR EDWARD GREY: I have no authoritative figures before me, but I should be glad to be assured that that was the truth.

Capture of a British Subject by Brigands at Salonica.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state the circumstances and conditions under which the British subject, Mr. Abbott, of Salonica, who was kidnapped by brigands, was released; what sum was paid by the British Consul to his captors; who provided the money; and whether he will take steps to secure repayment from the Turkish Government, as well as an adequate sum for compensation.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Mr. Abbott was released on the advance by His Majesty's Consul-General of a ransom of £T.15,000, which the Consul was authorised to make from public funds. The recovery of this sum from the Turkish Government is under negotiation. The question of compensation has not been raised, as far as I am aware, in this or in previous similar cases.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if Mr. Robert Abbott, a British subject, was a month ago captured by Turkish brigands near Salonica, and has now been ransomed by the British Consul; and, if so, will he say what ransom was paid, from what source it came, and what steps will be taken to recover the amount from the Turkish Government.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I would refer the hon. Member to the Answer I have to-day returned to the hon. and gallant Member for the St. Andrews Burghs.

MR. FELL: May I ask if the right hon. Gentleman has received any report from the Consul-General in Turkey as to the position of affairs in some of the large seaports, one of which I visited last February, and——

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. Personal statements are not admissible.

"The Mikado."

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he will say whether the views of the Japanese were consulted in withdrawing the licence for *The Mikado*; on whose advice did the Lord Chamberlain act, and will he state what were the considerations which prompted the action in this matter; whether the responsibility for the decision rests solely with the Lord Chamberlain; and will he generally reconsider the whole question as affecting the case of this play with a view to withdrawing the prohibition and limiting, by legislation or otherwise, the power of the Lord Chamberlain.

SIR EDWARD GREY: I understand that the Lord Chamberlain acted on his own responsibility solely. But, with regard to the last part of the Question, I may say that if my advice had been asked or given it would have been entirely in accord with the action which the Lord Chamberlain has taken, for reasons which I should have thought would have been obvious at this moment. I am not, therefore, prepared to reconsider the Question, even if it were in my province to do so.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: Who is responsible in this House for the action of the Lord Chamberlain?

SIR EDWARD GREY asked for notice.

British Commercial Interests in Asia Minor.

MR. HIGHAM (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will appoint at Mersina, Asia Minor, considering the importance of British shipping and other British commercial interests there, a British subject as Consul; and will he say who has had charge of the Consulate there since the promotion to higher posts some five years ago of Lieutenant-Colonel Massey, and two years ago of Captain Townshend.

SIR EDWARD GREY: Up to April, 1905, the British Vice-Consulate for the vilayet of Adana was situated at Adana in order that the Vice-Consul might be able to communicate easily with the Vali and central authorities of the district. Colonel Massey, who was appointed Vice-Consul in February, 1896, was succeeded by Captain Townshend in 1903. On Captain Townshend's transfer to another post in April, 1905, the Vice-Consulate for the vilayet was removed to Mersina on account of the growing commercial importance of the town, and Mr. Teofani Loiso, who was recommended to His Majesty's Government as the most suitable candidate, was appointed unsalaried Vice-Consul and still holds that post. It is doubtful whether a resident British subject with the necessary qualifications could be found at Mersina, and the trade does not appear to justify the appointment of a salaried Vice-Consul.

Chiswick Council Dispute.

MR. THORNE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the action of the police in preventing Councillor O'Brien from entering the Chiswick Council Chamber on Thursday, 18th April; and whether, seeing that the Chairman of the Council obtained the services of the police to prevent a councillor attending to his duties, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): The police were warned to be in the vicinity of the Chiswick Council Chamber on the 18th instant, as it had been intimated to them that a disturbance was feared; but they took no action to prevent Councillor O'Brien from entering the Council Chamber, nor did they in any way assist in his removal.

Paddington Borough Council and Local Traders.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY (Paddington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he has now received from the Paddington Borough Council any explanation of their refusal to take proceedings against local traders who have failed to supply the names and addresses of home-workers employed by them.

MR. GLADSTONE: Not yet, Sir. I understand that the matter is to be submitted to the Council at their meeting next Tuesday.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company.

MR. MURRAY MACDONALD (Falkirk Burghs): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, seeing that, under the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Act of 1859, c. 110, s. 47, the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company is bound to deposit with the Board of Trade a copy of any agreement with respect to the conveyance of passengers or goods which that company may make with any other railway or canal company, the company has within the last three years so deposited a copy of any agreement made with the London and North Western Railway Company; whether other railway companies are bound in similar fashion to deposit with the Board of Trade copies of such agreements; and, if not, whether he will consider the advisability of introducing legislation to impose such obligations on all railway and canal companies.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport): A copy of an agreement entered into by the Lancashire and Yorkshire and the London and North Western Railway Companies on the 31st December 1904, was deposited with the Board of Trade in accordance with the provision of the special Act referred to. We are not aware of any similar provision in any Act relating to companies other than the Lancashire and Yorkshire company, but I may point out that all working agreements between railway companies entered into under the authority of Acts incorporating the Railways Clauses Act, 1863, have to be deposited with and approved by the Railway and Canal Commission.

Woolwich Mechanics for Germany.

MR. FELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, if a considerable number of mechanics who were discharged from Woolwich Arsenal have been engaged by a firm of bicycle manufacturers of Dresden, Germany; and, if so, can a copy of their contract of engagement be supplied and can particulars be published in the *Labour Gazette* of the firms in Germany who are prepared to offer work to unemployed English artisans.

MR. KEARLEY: The Board of Trade have no information on the subject referred to in the first part of the hon. Member's Question, and no knowledge of the firms in Germany who are prepared to offer work to unemployed English artisans.

MR. FELL inquired if it was not the duty of the Board of Trade official to take special note of changes in the labour market of the character indicated in the Question.

MR. KEARLEY asked for notice of the Question.

Co-opted Guardians.

MR. SUMMERBELL (Sunderland): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been called to the co-option by the Tynemouth Board of Guardians of a member who was defeated at the election, as also the suggested co-option of a defeated member by the Easington Board of Guardians; and if so, will he state whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. JOHN BURNS, Battersea): A Board of Guardians are empowered by Statute to co-opt a Chairman, or Vice-Chairman, or both, and not more than two other persons from outside their own body but from persons qualified to be guardians of the union. I have no control over the guardians in the matter, but I understand that at Tynemouth the person co-opted had been an elected guardian during the preceding three years, that his business knowledge had been found to be valuable, and that at the recent election he only lost his seat by ten votes. In the Easington case the matter appears still to be under the consideration of the guardians.

Irish Poor Law Returns.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he has called for Returns from the Local Government Board in Ireland to lay before the English Royal Commission on Poor Law; when are these Returns likely to be required; and will his Department recoup the Irish Local Government Board for the expenses entailed in procuring the Returns indicated.

MR. JOHN BURNS: The hon. Member is, I think, under some misapprehension in this matter. I have not called for Returns from the Local Government Board for Ireland for the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws and Relief of Distress, nor would any expenses incurred by that Board in relation to Returns obtained for the Commission be payable out of the Vote for my Department. I may add that the reference to the Royal Commission is not limited to England, but extends to the United Kingdom.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY: Will the right hon. Gentleman send a copy of that Answer to the President of the Irish Local Government Board?

MR. JOHN BURNS: Certainly.

Postal Addresses in the Welsh Language.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the Posmaster-General whether in Wales the Post Office officials refuse to receive or deliver letters if addressed in the Welsh language, and will not speak to a Welshman in his native tongue; and whether, seeing that in Wales and Monmouthshire there are 280,000 Welshmen who speak their native language only, he proposes to take any action in the matter.

THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): The hon. Member appears to be under some misapprehension. The Post Office does not refuse to receive and deliver correspondence addressed in the Welsh language. Postmasters and postmen with a knowledge of Welsh are appointed in districts where such knowledge is found to be necessary.

Sick Leave Regulations in the Post Office.

*MR. GODDARD CLARKE (Camberwell, Peckham): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether the ordinary sick leave regulations, as stated by the chief medical officer, when giving evidence before the Select Committee, to be six months full pay and six months half-pay, apply to officers who are alleged to be suffering from mental infirmity; and, if not, what is the general practice in such cases, and after what lapse of time is an officer reported on as unfit for the service and recommended for pension.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The regulations regarding sick leave and pay apply in the case of officers suffering from mental infirmity in the same manner as in other cases. So long as there is a reasonable prospect of eventual recovery sick pay is allowed to established officers, up to a limit of six months on full pay and six months on half pay; but when an officer is certified to be permanently incapacitated he is retired with the pension or gratuity provided by the Superannuation Acts.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Is that the invariable rule?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I imagine so as regards established officers.

Australian Mail Contracts.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if he can state whether the arrangements have yet been made by the British and Australian Governments for the new Australian mail service contracts.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: I hope that satisfactory arrangements for the continuance of the Imperial Mail service to and from Australia will be completed shortly. I have no official information as to the progress of the arrangements for the additional service to be provided by the Commonwealth Government.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: When does the right hon. Gentleman expect information from the Commonwealth?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Of course we shall be informed, but we have no responsibility in the matter.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Are there not two contracts, one entered into by the Imperial Government, and the other by the Commonwealth?

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: Yes, but we have no control over the Commonwealth contract.

Music in Leeds Elementary Schools.

MR. O'GRADY (Leeds, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Education whether, in view of the fact that the teaching of music in the elementary schools at Leeds which has been given since 1882, and has resulted in benefit to the scholars, there being at present 547 children receiving instruction, the fees paid more than counterbalancing the expenses during the whole period, there is any intention on the part of the Board of Education vetoing such teaching in future.

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Mr. LOUGH, Islington, W.): The attention of my right hon. friend has only recently been called to this matter, and an official letter has already been sent to the Leeds Education Authority sanctioning the arrangements under certain reasonable conditions.

Beer Ingredients.

MR. MORTON: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can say what are the ingredients now used in the manufacture of beer in this country.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury): My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this Question. I beg to refer the hon. Member to the Return (Number 14) on Brewers Licences presented on the 14th February last which contains all the available statistics.

MR. MORTON: Are there any hops in beer at all now?

[No Answer was returned.]

Police Pensions and Income-Tax.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if, having regard to the fact that police pensions have been earned in protection of the public, and that throughout their service the recipients were compelled to contribute thereto a percentage of their pay, he can give an assurance that such pensions will be assessed for income-tax as deferred pay and not as accumulated savings.

MR. RUNCIMAN (for Mr. ASQUITH): I am giving very careful consideration to all the arguments which are urged in favour of admitting any or all of the different classes of pensioners to the benefit of the proposed concession to earned incomes, but I think it will be most convenient if I deal with the question of pensions as a whole when the Finance Bill comes up for consideration.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Will it be dealt with in the Finance Bill?

MR. RUNCIMAN: The point can be raised when the Bill is under consideration.

MR. P. BARLOW (Bedford): Is the matter still open for discussion?

MR. RUNCIMAN: Yes, Sir.

Village Rifle Clubs.

MR. HICKS BEACH: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in the event of members of a village rifle club receiving temporary permission to shoot rooks from the local landlord, he will direct the Inland Revenue authorities not to enforce the taking out of a gun licence, which such use of a rifle technically involves.

MR. RUNCIMAN: I see no reason for any such concession.

MR. HICKS BEACH: But in view of the stimulus this would give to rifle practice cannot the Government give way on this?

MR. RUNCIMAN: We are not prepared to diminish the revenue in this way.

Clerks to Surveyors.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will cause inquiry to be made into the position of clerks to surveyors of taxes, having regard to the fact that they have responsible public duties to discharge and are paid out of public funds, but have no fixity of tenure and no rights of pension.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The question of the organisation of the offices of surveyors of taxes is being considered by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and whether the employment of a larger proportion of established officers would be conducive to efficiency. As regards the pay and prospects of clerks at present employed in an unestablished capacity, I have no reason for thinking that their position compares unfavourably with that of persons engaged on similar terms upon the same class of work in other Government Departments.

MR. C. E. PRICE inquired if members of the engineering staff who were sometimes employed in a like capacity received pensions while the men referred to in the Question did not?

MR. RUNCIMAN: The circumstances of the two staffs are not on the same lines, and I am afraid therefore a comparison is not possible.

Burwell Crown Farm.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he can state the amount which it has been necessary to spend on the erection and alteration of buildings to adapt the Crown farm at Burwell to the requirements of the eighty-two small holders now in occupation; and if the expense has been borne by the Board of Agriculture, by the hon. Member for Newmarket, or by the small holders.

THE TREASURER TO THE HOUSEHOLD (Sir EDWARD STRACHEY, Somersetshire, E.): The estimated amount of the expenditure on the erection and adaptation of buildings on the Crown farm at Burwell is £1,800. This amount will be borne on the Land Revenues of the Crown, interest being paid by my hon. friend the Member for Newmarket in the shape of additional rent. He informs me that this additional rent is added to the rents paid by his sub-tenants

MR. BRIDGEMAN: Does the £1,800 represent the whole expense of placing eighty-two people on this farm?

SIR EDWARD STRACHEY: I think so, but if the hon. Member will put down a Question I will ascertain definitely.

Scottish Churches Dispute.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he can state the number of churches in the Highlands of Scotland that have been successfully claimed by the Free Church; and out of that number how many are at present vacant, and on whom the responsibility devolves of seeing that the spiritual interests of the people are duly cared for.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): In the five Highland Synods of the church, viz., Argyll, Moray, Ross, Sutherland and Caithness and Glenelg, the Free Church have prevailed in 113 cases, and the United Free Church in 119 cases. In the case of all the congregations in Orkney and Shetland, of which there are thirty-two, the property has been allocated to the United Free Church. The Royal Commission were charged with the duty of distributing certain property between the two churches, and in that regard their responsibility ends there.

MR. CATHCART WASON asked for an Answer to the last part of his Question.

MR. SINCLAIR: I have no information.

MR. CATHCART WASON: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire?

MR. SINCLAIR: I have no responsibility.

Dumbarton Drainage Works.

MR. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland what was the specific nature of the understanding given by the local authority of the burgh of Dumbarton in 1903; what was the nature of the works to which the said undertaking bore reference; whether he is aware that no purification works have been begun, and that all the sewage of the burgh now enters the Leven in an unpurified condition; whether this state of matters has his approval; and, if not, whether he will see that the Local Government Board now take steps to have the undertaking given by the burgh carried into effect if such should involve the construction of purification works.

MR. SINCLAIR: I am informed that the suggestion of the hon. Member as to a specific understanding on this subject is not fully sustained. The Local Government Board after an inquiry by their medical inspector pressed the removal of certain nuisances to which he had drawn attention. They now propose to inquire into the question of the condition of the sewage when it enters the Leven.

MR. R. DUNCAN asked if other burghs had been compelled to undertake sewage purification works by the Government?

MR. SINCLAIR asked for notice of the Question.

Ireland and the Court of Criminal Appeal.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Fermanagh, I beg to ask Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland whether it is intended to introduce this session a Bill to provide for a Court of Criminal Appeal in Ireland, or to insert clauses in the Bill of Mr. Attorney-General making it applicable to Ireland.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange): No, Sir. Having regard to the present state of public business, I do not think it will be possible to introduce such a Bill this session. As to the latter part of the Question I must refer my hon. and learned friend to the Attorney-General who is in charge of the Bill.

Clare Evicted Tenants.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if the investigation into the claims of the evicted tenants in county Clare have been completed; and when the work of reinstatement may be expected to commence on a general scale.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. BIRRELL, Bristol, N.): The Estates Commissioners inform me that up to the present sixty-two evicted tenants have been reinstated in county Clare. The great majority of the applications have been investigated, but as I said in reply to a Question yesterday, I do not propose to make any detailed statement on the subject until after the end of this month.

Irish Agricultural Department.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the indeterminate condition of affairs in the Irish Agricultural Department, he will see that applications for increases in the salaries of the higher officials of the Department shall not be entertained pending the appointment of a successor to Sir Horace Plunkett.

Mr. BIRRELL: I am not aware of any reason why the administration of the Department should not pursue its ordinary course. I need, however, scarcely add that no such applications for increases of salary are at present under the consideration of the Department.

Lambert Minors Estate, Athenry.

Mr. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state when the Report of the Estates Commissioners in connection with the purchase of the Lambert Minors Estate, Athenry, will be submitted to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland; is he aware that a number of decrees were taken out at the late quarter sessions held at Gort, and are now ripe for execution on this estate; and, in view of all the circumstances, will he consider the propriety of urging on the Estates Commissioners the desirability of sending in their Report at once, so that a settlement may be effected without putting the decrees into execution.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Estates Commissioners inform me that they have had a preliminary inspection made of this estate, which is under the control of the Lord Chancellor during the minority of the owner. The inspector's Report is at present under the consideration of the Commissioners, who will intimate to the Lord Chancellor at an early date the sum which they would be prepared to offer for the purchase of the estate if formal proceedings for sale to them should be instituted under Section 6 of the Irish Land Act 1903.

In answer to a further Question, the right hon. Gentleman said he was doing his best to expedite the inspection.

Lettermore Relief of Distress Scheme.

Mr. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the fact that in the relief of distress scheme in the Lettermore dispensary district, in the Oughterard Union, no district councillors were included on the relief committees, although it had been promised that the relief would be administered through local committees on which the district councillors were represented; and whether he is aware of the fact that the administration of relief in the Lettermore district is mainly in the hands of a Mr. P Toole, who is a bailiff and grabber of grass lands and of holdings of evicted tenants; and whether, in view of these facts, an independent inquiry will be made into the administration of relief in this district, where the poorest and most deserving people are neglected.

Mr. BIRRELL: The Distress Committee in the district referred to was formed by the local clergy and not by the Local Government Board. If any of the district councillors desire to become members of the committee they should apply direct to that body. The Local Government Board understand that Mr. Toole referred to in the Question is simply employed by the committee as paymaster, and has no part in the administration of the work.

Clifden Pier.

Mr. O'MALLEY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the cause of the delay in constructing the pier at Clifden, Connemara, which was promised under the Marine Works Act; and whether he can state when this work will be commenced.

Mr. BIRRELL: My predecessor's promise that the Government would endeavour to find a certain sum for marine works at Clifden was conditional upon the county council's undertaking to provide certain ancillary works, including an approach road. Upon this point no communication has yet been received from the county council, and therefore no progress in the consideration of the matter can be made.

Oranmore Outrage.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the night of 22nd April the house of Patrick Burke, near Oranmore, county Galway, was fired into by masked men; that Burke had refused to give up his employment as herd to a Mr. Costello at the dictation of the local branch of the United Irish League; whether this is considered by the police to be the reason for the attack; and whether the police have made any arrests in connection with the matter.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed by the police authorities that the fact is as stated in the first part of the Question, except that it is not known whether the offender or offenders were masked. The police are not aware that the United Irish League had any connection with the matter, and they have no evidence to show what the motive of the offender may have been. No arrests have been made.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG: Has the right hon. Gentleman any hope of any arrests being made in connection with this outrage?

MR. BIRRELL: Yes, Sir.

United Irish League—Clonfert Branch.

THE MARQUESS OF HAMILTON (Londonderry): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to a resolution of the Clonfert branch of the United Irish League, passed on Sunday, 21st April, giving notice to all graziers to surrender their grass farms, and threatening to publish the names of the graziers in order to focus public opinion on their action; and will he say what steps he has taken to protect the graziers of Galway in their lawful avocations.

MR. BIRRELL: I am informed that a resolution to the effect stated was published in a local newspaper. The police have taken, and will continue to take, all necessary steps for the preservation of the peace, and for the protection of all persons in the exercise of their legal rights.

Brosna Outrage.

MR. MOORE (Antrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Wednesday, 24th April, the house of a farmer named Forde, of Brosna, county Kerry, was attacked by a party of men, armed and disguised, who fired several shots into the dwelling; whether the reason for this attack has been ascertained; and whether any persons have yet been made amenable in connection therewith.

MR. BIRRELL: The fact is as stated in the Question. The house is situate on an evicted farm held by Forde, but is occupied by a caretaker. The motive for the offence can only be a matter of opinion. The police are still investigating the case, and no one yet has been made amenable.

Crime in Ireland.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): I desire to ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland if his attention has been called to an urgent appeal issued yesterday to Members of this House to provide Lord Ashtown with £3,000 a year to enable him to circulate accounts of alleged crimes in Ireland. Has the right hon. Gentleman seen the statement in it that events are constantly happening in Ireland of a most startling, shocking, and outrageous character, do the police reports confirm this allegation, and can any steps be taken to put a stop to Lord Ashtown's scandalous campaign?

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the penultimate word used by the hon. Member is in order, when referring to a Member of the other House.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: He is not a Member of the other House. He is only an Irish Peer.

*MR. SPEAKER: Still, he is not here to defend himself.

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL: He can appeal to the Courts.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH: I will withdraw the word "scandalous" and substitute "mischievous."

Mr. BIRRELL: I did see the paper in question. I certainly considered it contained a misleading account of the position in Ireland, and I hope the people of England will not assume that the condition of Ireland is as described in that letter.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the statements contained in this letter are taken out of one or other of the numerous Nationalist papers?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order.

Labourers (Ireland) Acts.

Mr. CHARLES CRAIG: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if the funds created for the purposes of the Labourers (Ireland) Acts, under the Labourers (Ireland) Act of 1906, will be in any way affected by the deficiency in the several counties occasioned by land purchase finance.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: So far as I am aware the funds made available for the purposes of the Labourers (Ireland) Acts by the Act of 1906 will not be affected.

Irish Salt Firkin Butter.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, if he can say what protection is afforded to the vendors of Irish salt firkin butter in the Butter and Margarine Bill when it contains more than 16 per cent. and less than 20 per cent. of water; and whether he intends to carry out the recommendation of the Departmental Committee on butter regulations in the year 1902 with regard to this butter.

Sir EDWARD STRACHEY: The Bill makes no alteration in the amount of moisture permissible in butter, whether English or Irish, unless it has been made, blended, re-worked or treated in a factory. The recommendation referred to it by the hon. Member was carried out by regulations issued in 1902.

Naval Debates and the Hague Conference.

Mr. MURRAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will arrange to take Vote 8 of the Navy Estimates before the meeting of the Hague Conference.

Mr. BELLAIRS: At the same time may I ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the fact that one-third of the armoured tonnage of this years' naval programme will be laid down, or otherwise, according to the measure of success which attends the proposals of the Government for the arrest of armaments; whether he is aware that the Admiralty and our delegates to the Hague Conference possess no authentic information as to the armaments of the six large armoured vessels Germany has commenced or is to lay down this year; and whether, in view of the present uncertainty, he will arrange for the discussion of Vote 8, Navy Estimates, to be taken after the results of the Hague Conference are known.

The PRIME MINISTER and FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Stirling Burghs): We will take Vote 8 as usual at a late period of the session so as to give the House the opportunity of discussing the programme with such emendation and revision as the experience of several months may suggest. That is the usual practice; it is a convenient one; and I see no reason why it should be departed from.

British Investments in the Colonies.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if the information at his disposal endorses the calculation that the investments of the Mother Country in the British Empire exceed £1,500,000,000 sterling, of which about one-third is in Colonial and Indian Government securities, one-third in commercial and industrial enterprises, and one-third in corporation and other loans; and if he can inform the House what proposals the Government has brought, or is going to bring, before the Imperial Conference now sitting to advance the industrial development, internal and external, of the over-sea dominions of the British people, so as to secure an adequate return for this outlay of capital by co-operative societies of working men, limited liability companies, and private individuals.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: This is a rather large question, and I cannot say at the moment whether the hon. and gallant gentleman's estimate is correct. However that may be, there is of course no question as to the magnitude of the interests to which he refers. And though there are no definite proposals to be laid before the Conference by His Majesty's Government, the whole subject is engaging the attention of His Majesty's Government and of the Conference.

SIR H. VINCENT: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the terms of the preference resolution agreed to by the Conference?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have nothing to do with that. It has nothing to do with the Government.

MR. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether Colonial preference is advocated in the interest of those who have shares in Colonial enterprises?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: My hon. friend had better address his questions to those who are in favour of Colonial preference.

Women on Local Authorities.

MR. MYER (Lambeth, N.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether in view of the fact that elections for borough councils take place on 1st November, he will introduce before that date a Bill to enable women to serve on local bodies.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We fully intend to proceed during this session with a Bill to enable women to serve on local authorities.

Standing Committees.

MR. CHIOZZA MONEY: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if his attention has been directed to the lax attendance of the Members of Standing Committees; whether he is aware that, while those Committees each consist of over eighty Members, the attendance at each of them frequently falls to thirty Members or less; and whether, in view of the fact that four such Committees are now created, to be charged with work of increased importance, he will, in the interests of efficiency, ask the House to consent to a new Standing Order ruling that any Member of a Grand Committee who is absent from his duties on two consecutive occasions without good cause shall forthwith be discharged from the Committee and another Member appointed in his place by the Committee of Selection.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am not aware that the facts are as stated, but if the hon. Member will read the new Standing Orders he will see that the discharge of Members for non-attendance is provided for.

Lords and Commons.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the fact that the legislatures of the Colonies and Dependencies of the British Empire have been framed, where they are representative, on the model of the legislature of the Mother Country, but that in these legislative systems there is no instance of a legislative council or second chamber framed on the hereditary principle, and no instance of a trace of a spiritual peerage, inquiry will be made, in view of the proposed alterations in the relations of the House of Lords and the House of Commons towards each other, as to the reason of the conscious departure in the form and structure of the Colonial legislative systems from their original by the omission in every case of a chamber of hereditary and spiritual Members, which in the British Parliament have so seriously controlled and affected the course of legislation.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think the reasons are pretty obvious, and any formal inquiry into the matter would cause unnecessary delay.

Transfer of Land—Legal Costs.

MR. G. GREENWOOD: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Government can furnish an approximate estimate of the aggregate amount of the legal costs annually incurred by landowners and others on sales, mortgages, and transfers of mortgages of land in England and Wales, and the costs which they would incur on the like transactions if a system of general registration with absolute title were in force under the Land Transfer Acts.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No doubt such a Return would be most useful, and I will inquire if it can be obtained without undue labour and cost.

MR. G. GREENWOOD: Will the right hon. Gentleman give me an Answer if I put the Question down at a later date?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Yes, but at a distinctly later date.

COLONEL HERBERT (Monmouthshire, S.): In the event of a Return being got out will the figures as to Wales be distinguished from the others?

SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I have not the slightest idea what form the Return will take. The point will be considered.

Irish Agricultural Department Vice-Presidency.

MR. MOORE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will consider a practical knowledge of agriculture essential as a qualification in any candidate for the position of Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture in Ireland.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The hon. Member may be assured that no one but a thoroughly qualified person will be selected for this post.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman carefully consider the claim of the Members of the Irish bar who are willing to take this or any other job?

[No Answer was returned.]

Irish Intermediate Education.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether his attention has been called to the fact that no vote for the purpose of intermediate education in Ireland appears on the Irish Estimates, and that consequently no discussion of this subject can be raised in the usual way; and whether, in view of the considerable income at the disposal of the Intermediate Education Board (Ireland), the failure of the Board to put into operation some of the chief recommendations of the Viceregal Commission of 1899, and the general dissatisfaction with its policy in other regards, he will give an opportunity to enable the state of secondary education in Ireland to be brought under the review of Parliament.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I doubt if there will be any opportunity of discussing this subject on any of the ordinary Votes, and I will see as the session goes on whether an opportunity can be found for discussing it.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of putting some item on the Estimates, so that the House may have the opportunity it does not get now of discussing the work of this nominated board whose expenditure amounts to £80,000 a year?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I will consult the Chief Secretary. I quite recognise the desirability of having such a discussion.

Education Bills.

*MR. CLOUGH (Yorkshire, W.R., Skipton): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to pass the Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill and the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill through this House this year; and whether he can state that the Second Reading of one or both of them will be taken before Whitsuntide.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not think that either of these Bills will be taken before Whitsuntide.

*MR. CLOUGH: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman for an Answer to the first part of my Question?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I am aware of no particular decision come to one way or the other.

Imperial Defence.

Mr. HICKS BEACH: I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he can give the names of the naval and military officials who formed the committee under General Owens, which inquired into the defences of Malta and Gibraltar.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is not usual to make public the names of members of committees of this nature, but I shall be happy to give the names to the hon. Member in private.

The Session.

Mr. S. T. EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether it is intended by the Government that the House should adjourn in July and meet again in the autumn, or whether some other, and what, alteration is to be made with reference to the time usually fixed for the commencement of the summer recess.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot yet give my hon. friend any information on this subject.

Mr. S. T. EVANS said his reason for putting the Question was that the Whips of the Government had been making inquiries as to whether the House should rise in June or July, in which case hon. Members would need to make different arrangements.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I was not aware that any direction had been given for an official inquiry. Many Members are very much interested in this matter and hold strong views, but I dare say they will take the ordinary means of propagating their opinions.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND asked the right hon. Gentleman whether his attention had been called to a Resolution on the Paper, for which no date had been fixed, affirming the desirability of the business of the House being so arranged that the Session should last in no year beyond the end of June, and whether, in view of the widespread feeling on all sides in favour of that change, he would see that some opportunity was given to hon. Members to express their views.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: We are all aware of the arguments *pro* and *con* on this Question, and, of course, we cannot clip this session short at the end of June without adding something equivalent at another time. I am not prepared to say whether that course would be adopted.

Mr. R. DUNCAN (Lanarkshire, Govan) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would take accurate means of ascertaining the desire of each Member.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That means taking a plebiscite, I suppose. I have always protested against making the convenience of Members the main consideration in settling the business of the House. The settlement of the business of the House must depend on the public interest.

Mr. S. T. EVANS gave notice that he would repeat his Question on a distinctly early date.

Mr. MYER asked whether, if the Prime Minister objected to studying the convenience of Members, he would study their health.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I did not say I do not consider the convenience of hon. Members. What I did suggest was that there were other considerations to be borne in mind.

CHINESE LABOUR.

LEAVE REQUESTED FOR MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. WALSH, in consequence of the unsatisfactory answer he had received a short time before, asked leave to move the adjournment of the House, in order to call attention to an urgent matter of definite public importance—namely, the presence in the Transvaal of 250 Chinese coolies, contrary to the provisions of the existing Chinese Ordinance and only at this moment disclosed to the House.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I have considerable doubts as to whether the Motion of the hon. Member comes within the rule of urgency. After giving such attention as I have been able to the matter, I think it does not come within the rule. There is no way of stopping these men going to the Transvaal. It is too late now; they are in the Transvaal. As far as I am able to judge, they come within the jurisdiction of the Transvaal Government, and, therefore it rests with the Transvaal Government to deal with the matter. For that reason I do not think that the Motion comes within the rule of urgency.

MR. SHACKLETON (Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe) asked the Prime Minister whether, in view of the feeling which had been aroused about these coolies, he would arrange to put down the Colonial Vote on a very early day.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I will consider the question of my hon. friend.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London) suggested that the Vote which would give the opportunity for free discussion to Members would be that of the Secretary of State, and expressed a hope that whatever arrangement was made the debate on it would be left unfinished, so that in the case of other developments further opportunities would be afforded of discussion later in the Session.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR asked the Prime Minister whether he could give the House any forecast of the course of public business between this and the Whitsuntide holidays.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The business on Monday will be the Resolution which stands in my name for the allocation of time for the consideration of the Army (Territorial Forces) Bill. On Tuesday there will be the introduction of the Irish Council Bill. On Wednesday the Report of the financial resolutions will be concluded, and other Bills will be taken. That concludes next week. On the following Monday the Finance Bill will be the first order, continued on Tuesday. On the Wednesday the Motion for the adjournment will be moved, and on Thursday Supply will be taken.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham) asked the right hon. Gentleman if he was aware that, in answer to a Question of his some sixteen days ago, he stated that he hoped to be able to announce in a week when his Resolution concerning the House of Lords would be taken.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The noble Lord must be aware, from his experience of life, that hopes are not always realised.

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

Second Report brought up, and read; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection that they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee A: Mr. Harold Cox and Mr. Theodore Taylor; and had appointed in substitution: Dr. Shipman and Mr. Ridsdale.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B: Sir John Baker; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Theodore Taylor.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee B (in respect of the Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill): Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Land Law (Ireland) Acts Amendment Bill): Mr. Moore.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had discharged the following Members from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill): Mr. Maddison, Mr. Alden, Sir John Benn, and Mr. Hart Davies; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill); Mr. John Ward, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Brunner, and Mr. Mond.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had added to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills the following fifteen Members (in respect of the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Seddon, Mr. Vivian, Mr. Brace, Mr. Hugh Law, Mr. McHugh, Mr. M'Killop, Mr. James Mason, Viscount Helmsley, Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, Mr. Abel Smith, Sir Samuel Scott, Mr. Long, Sir Frederick Banbury, Mr. Lambton, and Captain Balfour.

Sir WILLIAM BRAMPTON GURDON further reported from the Committee that they had added to the Standing Committee on Scottish Bills the following Fifteen Members (in respect of the Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill): Mr. Thomas Richards, Sir Walter Nugent, Mr. Sheehy, Mr. Boland, Mr. Leif Jones, Mr. Sherwell, Mr. Charles Roberts, Mr. Nield, Captain Faber, Mr. Ratcliff, Viscount Castlereagh, Mr. Remnant, Captain Craig, Mr. Meysey-Thompson, and Mr. Watson Rutherford.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILL.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES (TAXATION AND PURCHASE OF LAND) BILL.

"To provide for the Taxation and Purchase of Land by Local Authorties," presented by Mr. Thomasson; supported by Mr. Bell, Mr. Wedgwood, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Crooks, Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. Harwood, Mr. Levy, Mr. Shackleton, Mr. Alexander Harvey, Mr. John Robertson, and Mr. Snowden; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 30th May, and to be printed. [Bill 174.]

SUPPLY [7TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. EMMOTT (Oldham) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

CLASS III.

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £36,985, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Commissioner of Police, the Police Courts, and the Metropolitan Police Establishment of Dublin."

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.) rose to complain of the administration and the excessive numerical strength of the Dublin Metropolitan Police, and of the injustice of the exorbitant rates levied on the citizens of Dublin for their upkeep. He occupied, he said, a somewhat anomalous position in rising to move the reduction of a Vote which he considered was already too small, but it was the only means by which he could bring before the House a system of taxation without representation which at present prevailed in Ireland, and which was opposed to every constitutional principle of Government. He wished to say at the outset of his remarks, firstly, that he made no attack on the *personnel* of the force to whom he was doubtless well known, but rather on the system of government which gave it birth; and, secondly, that he had not much confidence in appealing to Ministers for justice to any part of Ireland. For many years he had been a silent but close observer of successive Irish Ministers, and their invariable practice in reply to the criticisms of Irish government had been to extenuate what they could not decently defend, and where they could do neither to wring their hands in despair and say, "What can I do? I have no power to interfere." And this declaration of a British Minister was supposed to be a final answer to any Irish grievance, no matter how galling the injustice might be. But sometimes there was a change, and when an unconscionable bargain was being forced upon Ireland the Financial Secretary to the Treasury was selected to defend it. In his opinion, if a Minister acknowledged the existence of unjust taxation, and found that under the existing law he had no power to remedy it, he should come to the House and ask for remedial legislation, and he believed the present House would give him the requisite authority, whatever unhappy fate might befall it in another place. He had no desire to say anything unkind about the present Chief Secretary. The right hon. Gentleman was in the springtime of his official career; he had made many legislative promises. He (Mr. White) would patiently await the harvest time to see what he would bring in, but in passing he might say that he had kept close count of the right hon. Gentleman's political pulse, and he thought he had discovered symptoms which, however slight at present, if he allowed them to develop would eventually, as in the case of so many of his predecessors, impair his political usefulness. He would trace the origin and growth of this infamous police tax. For the year ending the 31st March, 1836, the expenditure on the Dublin Metropolitan Police was £40,511—in round numbers, one half contributed from various local sources and the other half voted by Parliament. To-day the amount asked for was £151,000, an increase of £111,000. In the year 1837 an Act was passed "to make more effectual provisions relating to the police in the district of Dublin Metropolis." In describing the area of their operations the Act contained the significant words, "That Her Majesty's Castle of Dublin and all places situate and contained" within certain boundaries. Did the insertion of these words "Her Majesty's Castle of Dublin" not prove their contention absolutely, that the force was nine-tenths military or Imperial, and should be paid for out of Imperial funds? Otherwise, why should special provision have been made for the protection of that malodorous institution called Dublin Castle, that ancient citadel of foul oppression which feasted on the life-blood of the Irish people? The authors of that Act recognised, as the people of Dublin did to-day, that the great object of the police was to uphold and protect a foreign garrison in a hostile because a persecuted country. Since that Act became law down to the present day, the ratepayers of Dublin and surrounding townships had had to pay 8d. in the £ on their valuation, no matter what increase might take place in consequence of new buildings or the re-valuation of the city which was now taking place. Let them see how this rate compared with English cities and towns:—Dublin, 8d.; Manchester, 5d.; Sheffield (and police acting as fire brigade), 4¼d.; Leeds, 3·84d.; Bradford, 3·63d.; Hull, 4·293d.; Glasgow, 4d.; Birmingham, 4d. He was loth to quote Birmingham as a fair case, because he was quite sure the President of the Board of Trade would agree with him that the force in Birmingham was insufficient for the protection of life and property, owing to something in its environment. What was the cause of this disproportionment in rates between rich and progressive English cities and poverty-stricken Dublin? There could be and there was only one reason. In English towns the police was a civic force responsible to the local authority. It was to the interest of the local ratepayer to keep down the cost, and it was to the interest of the police to serve the ratepayers. They were the willing servants of a free people in a free country. The reverse was the condition in Dublin. The people had no control over the police, and the latter were not the servants of the ratepayers who paid them, but the representatives of Imperial power, who sometimes regarded it as their duty, according to the temper of the occupier of Dublin Castle, to harass mere Irishmen. He would ask the Committee to come back to the year 1841. At that time the population of Dublin was 235,864; in the sixty years to 1901 the population had increased to 290,638, an increase of 54,774; but in the same period of time the total upkeep of the Metropolitan Police had increased from £60,000 to about £160,000, or at the rate of nearly £2 per head of the increased population. Could anyone attempt to justify that enormously increased impost? Dublin at present enjoyed an exceptional immunity from crime of a serious character, with which no English city could compare. In the year 1862 the indictable offences in the whole district of the Dublin Metropolitan District numbered 9,520 while in the year 1902 they numbered only 2,696 or about one-fourth of what they were when the police force cost half what it did now. With regard to summary offences which were returnable for trial, in 1862 they numbered 43,694, while in 1902 they only numbered 29,726, so that increase in taxation had corresponded with diminution of crime. He would give the Committee some statistics with regard to the cost of police in English towns. In Dublin with its population of 390,187 the cost of the up-keep of the police in 1901 was £160,183. In Glasgow, with a population of 760,423, it was only £134,192, while the strength of the force was 1,379 as against the 1,172 in the Dublin force. The population of Manchester was 542,872 and the cost of police, £116,808. In Liverpool, with a population of 684,947, it was £193,273. If the cities of England were taken it would be found that the cost per head for the upkeep of the police was infinitely less than that of Ireland. The sum per head of the people of Leeds and of Sheffield was 2s. 6d., the cost per head in Dublin was 8s. 2½d. There was, as competent authorities agreed, practically no professional criminal class in Dublin, yet let the Committee compare the conditions with those which existed in cosmopolitan London. In London the charge per head of the population for the upkeep of the police was 6s. 6½d. as against 8s. 2½d. in Dublin. In London there was one policeman for every 380 of the population as against one for every 333 in Dublin. In wealthy London the police rate was 5d. in the £; in Dublin 8d. If London was policed at the same rate as Dublin, it would cost the ratepayers £559,000 per annum more than it did at present, while in London the police were expected to do many duties not imposed on the police in Dublin. He thought he had proved conclusively that Dublin was the most lawful and peace-abiding city in the Empire. When a city was over-policed and that city was a crimeless city it led to corruption in many ways. They all knew that from time to time emissaries had been sent out from Dublin Castle to provoke conspiracies to justify the existence of the police, and the existing position was a direct incentive to manufacture charges. He had in his hand a copy of the "Five cases" circular issued by the Chief Commissioner of the Police of Dublin in January, 1897. Would any member of the Committee attempt to justify such a circular if it had to do with any country in the world except Ireland? They would look on it as an outrage; but because it had to do with Ireland somebody would be found to stand up and defend it. In Dublin licensed houses were owned by the licensees. Every man in possession of a licence had his all invested in it. He was not tied to a brewer or to a distiller. It was therefore his interest to conduct his house respectably, for two endorsed convictions and a third conviction not endorsed would put an end to his existence. Yet how was he treated? His house was visited again and again. His customers were cross-examined. They were told to stand up and in some cases they were even asked to walk a chalk line. Why was all this? Not to vindicate the law—a policeman in England as a rule strove to do nothing more—but in Dublin he had to make cases in order to satisfy his superiors, and in order to try to justify his own and their existence. That might seem an extraordinary statement, but the circular to which he had referred was a direct incentive to the police to manufacture cases. It was a kind of black list presented periodically to the Chief Commissioner containing the names of patrol officers and men who had made less than five cases within three months. It contained the name of patrol officers and men who had made (either by arrests or summons) less than five cases within the last three months and was headed as follows:—

Name.	Rank and Number.	Number of Cases made in past twelve months.	Number of cases made in preceding twelve months.	Superintendent's Remarks.

One would imagine that the standard of efficiency of a policeman ought to be the absence of crime in his patrol, or the absence of complaint on the part of people residing or doing business on his patrol rather than the number of cases he succeeded in making. However, it was not so in Dublin. A policeman was put on the black list if he did not make cases. In the effort to make cases he would take the case of the licensed trade. For every conviction secured up to 1905, a case was dismissed. In licensing cases the Chief Commissioner avowed that he had no function. He said the magistrate was the proper person to investigate every charge. With every respect for the Commissioner of Police, it was his duty to investigate the details of every charge brought against a ratepayer, and to weigh the circumstances carefully before he allowed a summons to be issued. But he only did this when the men under him were likely to get into trouble. He would give a typical example. Within the last few months a sergeant named Cox arrested a man for being drunk on licensed premises. The man had been removed from the licensed premises five times before the sergeant arrived on the scene, and when he did arrive on the scene the principal assistant in the house was in the act of putting him out. Sergeant Cox made his Report, and the Chief Commissioner ordered three summonses to be issued, one for disorderly conduct, one for supplying drink to a drunken man, and one for permitting drunkenness. The summonses were signed by the magistrate, but withdrawn when the fact was brought to the knowledge of the Chief Commissioner that the prosecuting sergeant had made a Report which would have been contradicted by the station sergeant. In reference to this case a question was asked in the House and the answer given was that the summonses were withdrawn because there was some doubt as to the "recollection" of the prosecuting sergeant. If Colonel Ross's attention had not been called to this case the summonses would, of course, have been issued, and dismissed, as 50 per cent. of the summonses were; but if, in calling attention to the case the person who did so had not disclosed the false nature of the Report made by Sergeant Cox, contradicted as it was by the station sergeant and a constable, the cases would have gone on and the licensed trader would have been put to great expense. That case was but an example, and whatever opinions his hon. friends might have on liquor questions he was sure they were all agreed that those engaged in the licensed trade were entitled to whatever protecton the law gave them. He hoped he had convinced the Committee that Dublin was a most orderly and peaceful city, yet the most police-ridden and police-taxed city in the three kingdoms. He had no doubt that right hon. Gentlemen on the Government benches were eager to stand up and—to their own satisfaction—completely demolish his case with some rusty, but oft-used arguments supplied by the Lords of the Treasury. There was no one in the House more capable of dressing in soothing words, well used wares than right hon. Gentlemen opposite. He had no doubt that he would be told that the proportion of the British exchequer contribution to the Dublin Metropolitan Police was larger than that of any other city in the kingdom. He freely admitted that was so, but that furnished no answer to his case, for no other city in the kingdom except London had a force not under civic control; the force in every other town was a civic force, and if they wanted a semi-Imperial establishment in Dublin they should pay for it out of Imperial funds. Ireland did not require one-fourth of the present force; they were for England's purposes, and she should pay for them. The number of police in Dublin bore no proportion to anything except the broken promises of the right hon. Gentlemen's predecessors in office. The matter was once before put before the Lords of the Treasury. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover was most sympathetic and promised to use his influence, but apparently his influence was not sufficient to get any reduction. Four reasons were given against it which were not important. One was the configuration of the roads—which was not a strong argument, because there were roads in other parts of the Empire which contained a greater number of miles. Another argument was that Dublin was not a provincial town but the seat of Government. It was an argument of the Nationalist Members that if for the purposes of the town they were excessive they ought to be reduced and the saving in cost ought to go to the Irish taxpayers. They admitted there was an alien Government in Dublin and said that if the Government gave Dublin the control of the police she would pay for them. The over-taxation of the citizens of Dublin for the upkeep of an unnecessary force was but one of the many instances which abounded in every Government department in Ireland, and the multiplication of which had made Ireland, notwithstanding the fertility of its soil, the poorest country in the world. He quite recognised that the right hon. Gentleman was surrounded by many difficulties; he was the heir to many bad traditions, and the greatest drawback was that the Government of England in Ireland had no moral force behind it. The difficulties might be great, but they were not insurmountable. He would quote for him the noble words recently uttered by an eminent statesman who had now become Prime Minister of England. These were his words—

> "The Irish people are entitled to a better and a different form of Government, a Government springing from and controlled by the people themselves."

Let the right hon. Gentleman adopt those words in their entirety and the question would be solved; Ireland would be happy and prosperous; they would cease to bother themselves about the many failings and shortcomings of the Government. They would in their own land mind their own business, for it was only the paternal hand of a paternal Government deriving its power from a Legislature on Irish soil that would need no force to win respect and obedience to its every wish. He begged to move.

*Mr. J. P. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said he seconded the Motion because he happened to be one of the Members of the municipal authority which represented the citizens of Dublin and who had yearly to levy a rate for this heavy impost. There was no question that it was creating great annoyance and it was considered a hardship that the members of the Dublin Corporation should be compelled to levy a rate of 8d. in the £ for the upkeep of the police. He did not intend to say a word against the police as a body. They were as fine a body of men as any in the Empire. They were, however, under the control of Dublin Castle and had to do as Dublin Castle ordered. They had heard from the hon. Member for Meath that it was not expected of the police to preserve the city from crime but rather to make crime. The circular the hon. Member referred to was only a corollary of one issued some time ago, wherein a sergeant of a particular division insisted that at least five cases per month should be brought in by every policeman in the district. Such a thing could not have taken place in this country. It would not be tolerated for twenty-four hours in England that they should pay for the upkeep of the police, and have no voice in the control of that body. Year after year this question came up before the corporation, and they were asked by several corporators not to levy this tax. They had done everything they could to draw attention to the grievance. They had appealed to the representatives of the Government in Ireland and had received honeyed words on every occasion. The right hon. Member for Dover admitted in 1902 that this tax was excessive, and expressed sympathy with them when they protested, and there the matter ended, and the tax went on as before. Was it the intention of the House to compel the Dublin Corporation to take the matter into its own hands and refuse to levy this unjust tax? The hon. Member for Meath had pointed out what was paid in England and Scotland for the upkeep of the police. Was it expected that the citizens of Dublin would stand idly by and let this go on much longer? He was not one of those who had taken any extreme side with reference to this question in the past. But when it came before the Corporation on the last occasion it was proposed that the levy should not be made. He did not support that proposition, but supported a proposition that they should make the levy and hold the money. The matter came up again last year, and wise counsels again prevailed and the levy was made. He recognised that the police had to be maintained, but contended that they should be maintained at a reasonable cost. The question must come up again, and unless they had some promise from the right hon. Gentleman that something would be done to put Dublin on an equality with such big towns as Manchester, Bradford, Liverpool, and Glasgow, he could not answer for what course would be taken by the Dublin Corporation next year. It was a serious question, but one which had to be faced. He did not wish to put obstacles in the way of the right hon. Gentleman, and did not like to bring the question forward now because he knew it was a legacy from the right hon. Gentleman's predecessors. In 1856 the valuation of the city was £510,569 11s., and the tax was 8d. in the £ for the upkeep of the police; the valuation in 1902 was £871,119, and although the police force was numerically the same as in 1856, the same charge of 8d. in the £ was levied on the increased valuation. Dublin was not standing still. Its valuation was increasing, but for every £ of increase an additional 8d. was levied for the cost of the police. Would the right hon.

Gentleman look into that matter and explain how that came about? When the tax was first imposed fifty years ago it was not to exceed 8d. in the £, but the maximum had always been maintained, although the valuation had increased and the police force had not. That was a most extraordinary thing. When he heard of 8s. 2½d. for the upkeep of the police in Dublin he asked himself whether this money could not be put to better uses for which money was urgently required, for the housing of the people and so forth, rather than on an ornamental force, because it was admitted that crime did not exist in the city. His hon. friend had already called attention to what was paid in England as contrasted with Ireland. In Dublin they paid 8s. 2½d., whereas in a place like Manchester they paid only 4s. 3d., and in Birmingham 3s. 1½d. Surely there must be something wrong if the City of Dublin was called upon to pay 8s. 2½d. In Dublin the strength of the police was 1,172, or one policeman to every 330 of the population. In Glasgow the strength of the police was 1,379, or one policeman to every 551 of the population. In Birmingham the strength of the police was 1,820 for a population of 522,182, or one policeman to each 636 of the population. Surely, it was hardly necessary to argue the matter further. Was Dublin more turbulent, was crime greater there, that they should be compelled to have one policeman for every 330 of the population? It was an outrage on the city; it was a crime to impose such a charge on a city which wanted development, and where the unfortunate poor had to pay a charge which rightly should only be something like 4d. in the pound. The difference between that charge and the amount actually paid represented something like £15,000, a sum which could be better spent in the upkeep of the city. He hoped and trusted that they would not receive purely empty promises, but that the matter would be seriously considered and something done. It had been stated that the whole sum for the upkeep of the police was £150,000, but, as had been pointed out, if they wanted an Imperial force by all means let them pay for it. What they objected to was the imposition of this charge on Dublin. In Dalkey, which might be considered on the borders of Dublin, and where there were suburban residences, they had a population of 3,396, and there were twenty-seven police to keep them in order. Then in Lerwick with a population of 4,500 the number of police to keep that population in order was three. He certainly thought that any honest man—and there were honest Englishmen on both sides of the house—would be prepared to do justice to Ireland and to Dublin. Something must be done to relieve that city of this terrible tax. He spoke as a member of the Dublin Corporation. He had endeavoured in a humble way to persuade his colleagues to see that the tax was levied, and he had promised that the question should be brought before the House. He had come from a sick bed to redeem his pledge, and he appealed to the fairplay of Englishmen to do justice by seeing that justice was done in regard to this tax, which was protested against by every section of the community—Protestants and Catholics, Unionists and Nationalists—who all said that it was a scandal which should not exist, and he hoped the Government would see their way to do something to relieve them from it.

Motion made, and Question proposed—"That a sum, not exceeding £36,885, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Patrick White.*)

*MR. MCKEAN (Monaghan, S.) said the figures which had been quoted by his hon. friends were irrefutable, and everyone who had listened to the speeches they had made must have come to the conclusion that they had disclosed a scandal of the first magnitude, and one which required redress at the very earliest opportunity. There was another and very important aspect of this question. If the police force of Dublin were reduced to its proper proportions to-morrow, the question would be still unsolved in many ways, because the whole spirit of the system was vicious and rotten. Why? Because the system on which the Dublin Metropolitan police were controlled and administered was one that was contrary to everything that was natural. The policeman in Ireland was not more than an official idler. As a rule he degenerated into a uniformed loafer. The police themselves were not to be blamed for this; it was the spirit of the system; the cold, hard, official system was the cause. His theory was that a policeman should be not only an officer engaged in the detection and prevention of crime, but should be a sort of little parish providence, looking after wastrels, and trying in his own way, and so far as the conditions and limitations of his office permitted him, to rescue these unfortunate people. His right hon. friend had referred to the case of Lerwick; let him also refer to that case in another connection. He found that in Lerwick a policeman was engaged in various duties in addition to his ordinary duties. He was engaged, for instance, under the Sanitary Acts, and the Food and Drugs Acts, and he looked after the fishing vessels, etc. In the same column of the Return from which he was reading, he found that those duties, in regard to the police in Ireland, were marked *nil.* They had no extra duties. No; the Dublin policeman stood at the corner, very near a public-house, a vast mountain of bones and flesh, doing absolutely nothing of value for the inflated salary that he was paid. That was typical of English methods of administration in Ireland—the maximum of expenditure with the minimum of result. They wanted this state of things ended, and ended at the earliest possible moment. The Dublin police were singularly intelligent, and, so far as their conditions allowed, a very reputable body of men. Personally he had not one word to say against the Dublin policemen; but he did say that the present system only resulted in defrauding the public, while it demoralised and degraded the policemen. There were ways in which the Dublin police might be employed. They could, he would suggest, assist in the administration of compulsory education by helping the attendance inspectors to get the children to school. Did they do that? Oh, no: in the place where he lived the attendance inspector got no sort of assistance from the police, who were too lordly to give it. Why? Because they were not under local control. The whole system was useless, owing to the centralised and bureaucratic methods of the Government. Until they pulled down this centralised system in Ireland, and until they put the police under the local control of the people's representatives, they would never rectify its existing defects and evils. The police could be usefully employed in aiding charitable associations, because they had knowledge of the slums of Dublin, and knew the men who were out of employment and who were deserving of assistance. But the Dublin police would not condescend to that sort of thing, whereas, in fact, these various employments of their time should form part of their essential duties. It was a well-known fact, and it was very frequently the subject of comic illustrations, that the Dublin policeman was always conspicuous by his absence when there was a row; and, when heads were broken, eyes blackened, and noses bleeding, the policeman turned up and settled the whole affair.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): That does not happen in Dublin.

*MR. McKEAN said perhaps the hon. Gentleman's information was better than his, but he had himself, in Dublin, looked out for the policeman to see if he would come and separate the combatants. No; he came just after the whole thing was over, and, like the *deus ex machina*, he appeared and settled everything. In London, the police, he believed, did give value for their salaries. Anybody passing through the main thoroughfares of London could witness the hard work which the policeman did in controlling the traffic. There was one place in England, and one officer in England, whichp lace and which officer presented to his mind a valuable object lesson in what a police force could be made to do, and the magnificent work which could be got out of it. If the Committe would permit him, he would like to quote some passages from an article written by Mr. W. B. Gentle, the head of the Brighton police. He said—

"The police can also encourage and protect poor children who are suffering from exposure from leading the lives their fathers have been forced to lead before them. For example, perhaps a father goes home at night and finds six or seven children hungry and asking for food, and badly clothed. He has no food to

> give them, and goes out feeling that he will get something to eat in some way. During his weary search for work temptation suddenly presents itself—he steals some food for his starving children and is arrested. It is that kind of crime in Brighton that I am endeavouring to prevent. My plan is this with the Children's Clothing Fund: A policeman sees a child badly clothed; he inquires about the father's surroundings and circumstances, and eventually with my approval the family is provided with clothes and food, and employment is found for the father. That obviates the necessity for that man to steal and prevents crime in its initial stage."

He thought the policemen in Ireland would be much better employed upon a plan of that sort than in spying after Irish Members of Parliament and other unfortunate people of that sort. The Brighton chief constable went on to say—

> "This would have an excellent moral influence on the police just as much as on the poor; it puts the police in better touch with the public, and cultivates the policemen's intelligence and powers of observation. This scheme will be gradually developed and extended. Every time the subject is discussed and made known some further benefit to the public generally discloses itself, and in whatever police force this plan has been tried it has succeeded. This fund in Brighton is entirely under my own personal jurisdiction, assisted by a committee of local ladies and gentlemen. The policeman always has cards with him with details in each case—name, address, number in family, father in employment or not, if in employment where, and how long in present situation, furniture of house and various other particulars. He then reports to the superintendent; the superintendent inquires still more closely and recommends what is best for each member of the family. The superintendent then reports to me. If the father is out of work every effort is made to find him employment; the mother is requested to bring the children to an arch on the beach, which is used as a wardrobe every Saturday."

He had quoted at some length from this article, because he considered it ought to be a sort of gospel for policemen and officers and even for Ministers who were ultimately responsible. He thought the whole police system of Ireland was wrong, vicious, and demoralising, and the same vice ran through the whole criminal code. The Irish Criminal Code, instead of preventing crime, created and put a premium upon crime. In Ireland the system bribed the policemen to manufacture crime. He could never forget the convincing story told by the Leader of the Irish Party of how the Irish police mutilated cattle, sent threatening letters and committed other crimes, and afterwards brought innocent men into the Court and accused them of those crimes and suborned false witnesses. That was only part and parcel of the abominable system which England maintained and perpetuated in Ireland. He hoped that on this occasion the Chief Secretary would not treat them to the usual explanations which in the past had been given from the Treasury Bench. What they wanted in Ireland was a man who would reform the whole rotten system, root and branch, and the man who tried to butter up the present system had better pack up his portmanteau and clear out. The police tax as administered at the present time in Dublin was really illegal. The Act of Vic. 1, c. 25, did not justify the levy which was made. There was a surplus every year hidden away, and nobody knew how it was appropriated. How was that £50,000 a year, of which no record was given, spent? What was done with it? There were secret methods and they wanted to get to the bottom of the secrecy. The only effective remedy would be to localise and decentralise the system and place the police under the control of municipal authorities and county councils, who would see that they extracted some value out of the police instead of allowing them to lounge about the whole day doing nothing.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said he felt sure that before the debate came to a close they would have a speech from the Leader of the Irish Unionist Party, because this was a matter which affected his constituency very considerably; and if he would refer to the Dublin newspapers of yesterday he would find that strong resolutions were adopted in many of the urban district councils of South Dublin calling upon the Government to inquire into the present position of the police and bring relief to the ratepayers. He had in his hand a resolution adopted by the Blackrock, the Rathmines, and the Dalkey District Councils, which were composed of Unionists and Nationalists, a fact which would go to prove that in this matter there was considerable unanimity in Ireland. This was a matter which affected not merely Nationalists but the ratepayers at large, who urged the Chief Secretary to inquire into the matter and to lose no time in giving some relief to the people. The Chief Secretary for Ireland was learning probably for the first time the position which the Dublin Police Force occupied, and he should take particular note of the fact that the question was entirely separate and distinct from the general question of the policing of Ireland. The Constabulary in Ireland were on a totally different footing, and the Dublin Metropolitan Police occupied a different position as well. He might say on behalf of all the Irish Members, or at any rate on behalf of those who had come into contact with the Metropolitan Police, that against that force there was no sort of objection whatever. As far as he knew and as far as his experience went, the police force in Dublin did the work required of them as efficiently as the police of London or any other great city in the world. It was not against the police individually or collectively that any objection was taken, because, as the Lord Mayor of Dublin had just declared, the force was composed of intelligent and respectable men who were anxious to do their duty by their fellow-citizens. The objection was that the force was entirely outside the control of the people. The representatives of the people on the Municipal Council of Dublin had no control over the police force, although they were compelled to levy an extremely heavy rate for upkeep. Sometimes they were told that the Irish representatives made unreasonable requests and exaggerated the disabilities from which the Irish people suffered. He would ask any English or Scottish Member if he could conceive a similar state of affairs in reference to the police existing in any other part of the United Kingdom. Here was a great city governed by a municipal council freely elected by the citizens, and yet the representatives of those citizens were denied absolutely any voice whatever in the control of the force which was to keep order in the city, and to see that the life of the people was carried on under ordinary civilised conditions. In England or Scotland such a state of affairs would not be permitted for a single moment. He asked the Chief Secretary to realise what was the cause of a great deal of the discontent of the people. It was that they were treated in an entirely different way from the citizens of the United Kingdom or of any other part of the Empire. Why in the name of goodness should not the citizens of Dublin through their representatives be as well entitled to control, manage, and regulate everything in connection with the police force as the citizens of any Scottish, English, or Welsh town? They were generally told that the Irish people had really nothing to complain of. Hon. Gentleman above the gangway would probably oppose this Motion on the ground that the Nationalist representatives were exaggerating, and that Irishmen were in as good a position in this matter, and in every other matter, as Englishmen and Scotsmen. He would point out to the Chief Secretary that in this particular case the circumstances were entirely different from those prevailing in England and Scotland. As a matter of fact the citizens of Dublin were treated as if they were entirely unworthy of having any responsibility whatever cast upon them, and as if they lacked the ability and the intelligence necessary for the ordinary work of policing their own city. The levy made was the maximum and far in excess of what was necessary, and he asked the right hon. Gentleman whether it was not possible without any unnecessary delay whatever to alter this and to give relief to the ratepayers of the city and county of Dublin. As the Lord Mayor had just declared, if some action was not taken in this matter by the Government, and if the grievance was not recognised, undoubtedly the day would come when the whole case would be complicated and rendered infinitely more difficult by the action which would be taken by the representatives of the city in the municipal council, who would probably strike against the payment of this tax or the paying of it over to the Government at all. He asked the Chief Secretary in the new spirit which they all believed was abroad with reference to Irish affairs, to obviate any difficulty of that kind and to make a statement which would clearly show to the citizens of Dublin that there would be no necessity for their representatives taking any strong course in the matter, that the grievance was recognised by the Government, and that a remedy would be applied without any loss of time. He would not go into the question of the strength of the force in Dublin, as that had already been dealt with by his hon. friends. Certainly when they found that there was really less crime of any sort in proportion to the population than in any other city in the whole Empire—indeed in the whole civilised world—and when they found at the same time that the cost of the police force was infinitely higher in Dublin, he thought every reasonable person must come to the conclusion that something was radically wrong, and that there was urgent need for some change. With regard to the state of the city of Dublin, of ordinary dangerous vicious crime there was an almost entire absence. Any small disturbances that there might be from time to time in the city of Dublin arose perhaps from excess—not so much compared with other cities—in the matter of drink, but leaving that on one side there was an almost entire absence of serious crime. There was no real criminal class, and on the occasion of the Horse Show, and at other times when large numbers of people congregated, they found that in the cases of pocket-picking and other charges of that kind which came before the police court, the persons arrested almost invariably came over specially for the occasion either from Scotland or England. He did not wish in the slightest degree to blame hon. Members from England or Scotland on this point, but he thought it was only fair to say that the conditions were as he had described. They had a police force far greater than was necessary, costing more than any police force in any centre in the world. The people of Dublin and of Ireland generally were as much alive to the necessity of an adequate police force as the people of any other country in the world. They knew that no great centre of population could continue to exist without an adequate force of police. They did not ask for the total abolition of the police force, but that they should not have more than was necessary and that great cost should not be imposed upon them. The root of the whole matter was to be found in the denial of the right of the citizens to manage this affair for themselves. If they were given that right, he was sure they would exercise it with the greatest possible judiciousness and economy, and at the same time with efficiency, because it was the interest of the whole of the citizens to have efficiency. He asked the Chief Secretary to recognise that a genuine case had been made out by the chief magistrate of the city of Dublin and other representatives of Ireland, and to give them some assurance which would convince the citizens of Dublin that there would be no need to go to extremes in the matter, but that at the earliest stage the police force would be put under the control of the representatives of the people, and that in the meantime this altogether unjust and unnecessary burden of taxation would be removed from the shoulders of the people.

The CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. Birrell, Bristol, N.) said this was a very thorny and difficult question and had been presented with great force. He was very glad to hear the speech of the Lord Mayor of Dublin. It was rather difficult for a Chief Secretary to deal with a matter of this kind. He had been told by previous speakers that honeyed words or empty promises were not wanted. What was wanted apparently was "a still strong man in a blatant land," who with one sweep of his hand would get rid of this bad system. He was not much of a believer in the "still strong man in the blatant land," for such a man was very apt to be a blatant man in a still strong land. He rather agreed with those who thought that this was a matter which would have to be eventually controlled and worked out by the people of the city of Dublin themselves. There were one or two things to which the attention of the Committee ought to be called. There was no doubt that the Dublin ratepayer did pay a very high police rate, namely, 8d. in the £1. That was larger than the rate paid in London, which was 5d. in the £1. Not only was it a fact that the rate was unusually high, but the ratepayer had no control. It was only fair, however, to point out that in so far as having no control over the police was concerned, the Dublin ratepayer shared that disadvantage with the London ratepayer. The people of the metropolis of London had no control over their police, and that had always been supposed to be due to the metropolitan character of

London. He thought it must be admitted that Dublin was a metropolis also, and that consequently that city was entitled to have a large contribution from the Imperial Exchequer for the purpose of maintaining its police. The maximum rate allowed by the London Police Act was ninepence for London, but the rate was relieved by a grant equal to fourpence in the £1 out of the Local Taxation Account. The police rate was thus fivepence in the £1. The total cost of the London Police was roughly £2,200,000, and of this £1,000,000 was raised from the police rate and the balance was derived from the Local Taxation Account, and from local revenue, fines, carriage licences, and the like. In London, therefore, the cost was borne practically in equal proportions between the ratepayers and Imperial sources, and the whole control of the police was vested in the Imperial Parliament. In Dublin the Police Rate was eightpence in the £1; that was a very large rate, but it was only one third of the actual cost of the police. The actual cost was something like £150,000. The other two-thirds of the cost were derived from the Exchequer. As to the question whether Dublin was or was not over-policed, he would hesitate to express an opinion on his own knowledge on a subject of that kind, but he was disposed to think that Dublin was over-policed. He thought there was a larger body of police than was necessary to maintain peace and order in that great city. He was glad to notice that everybody who had spoken had paid a high tribute to the general character and intelligence of the police in Dublin. Of course the police generally were subject to a great deal of criticism in these days, and he was quite ready to admit that the police would always be open to criticism. Gentlemen from Ireland must not suppose that they had a monopoly of criticism in that respect. It was regrettable that the London police had been made a matter of criticism, and it could be said that they were not entirely free from criticism. He was glad that in the view of hon. Gentlemen from Ireland the police of Ireland were an intelligent and nimble body of men. He was sorry that reference had been made to a very unfortunate expression used by a superintendent about "making cases." It was a sinister kind of expression, and he was glad it had attracted criticism, and had been the subject of attack. He did not think it necessary that on an incident of that sort any general imputation should be cast upon the police. Barristers talking about cases, and doctors talking about patients used such jargon of expression which, if it became known among the uninitiated, would give rise to a good deal of gloomy thoughts. Surely it was not to be supposed that the expression in question was to be taken in its literal sense as expressing the general habit of the police in manufacturing cases in order to show their activity. This temptation was one to which every policeman and professional man was subject, and so far as he resisted it he was entitled to praise, and so far as he fell a victim to it he should be most seriously blamed. The expression had received grave attention at headquarters, and had been condemned by everybody responsible for the police. Everybody responsible for the police, who knew his duty would be alive to the temptation which existed in any body of men to exceed their duties, and to exhibit their zeal in an unnecessary and improper manner. The police of Dublin were quite as capable of resisting that temptation as any body of police in any part of the kingdom. Dublin was treated as a metropolis. Its police were not subject to local control any more than the police in London, and the contribution of the Treasury to their maintenance was larger than that in any other part of the United Kingdom. He agreed that it was the duty of the Corporation of Dublin to make representations with reference to the size of the force, and anything the Government could do safely and wisely—and he was disposed to think they could do something in that direction—to reduce the Dublin police force, should be undertaken; and it would be a desirable thing if the Treasury could see their way to make their grant towards the maintenance of the police force a fixed sum, so that the ratepayers of Dublin, who for many years past had been paying this maximum rate of 8d., should have the benefit of any economies that could be effected by means of the reduction of the force. That was the only way where any reform lay in the reduction of the force. Of course, the the number of the police was a question in which the corporation had no voice, but any representations they could make to the Government showing that in any respect the force could be safely reduced in size, or that the expenses could properly be reduced, would certainly receive the earnest consideration of the Irish Government. So far as the Treasury was concerned, his view was that they should be approached with a view to fixing the amount of their grant.

MR. J. P. NANNETTI asked if the Government would assist the Corporation of Dublin in finding out in what proportion this money was paid away. What was wanted was information to show in what way reductions could be made consistent with the maintenance of order.

MR. BIRRELL said that the request of the hon. Gentleman was absolutely reasonable, for no general conclusion could be arrived at as to how the reduction of such a force of men could be effected without a complete knowledge of all the circumstances.

MR. KETTLE (Tyrone, E.) said that this was a question relating to the Government of Ireland, and he thought he would carry with him the sympathy of his colleagues when he said that they recognised the difficulty of the problem with which the Chief Secretary was confronted. He did not think that any weight could be given to the comparison between the police force of the city of London and that of the city of Dublin. London was an international metropolis, it was a city apart. Dublin was a national capital. London had to deal with its own problem, just as Dublin had to deal with its. As to the Imperial grant-in-aid for the maintenance of the police, it must be borne in mind that it flowed first into the Exchequer from the taxpayers of Ireland. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to remember that, when he came with a new spirit to the administration of the government of Ireland. Something had been said as to the history and character of the police force in Dublin. It was constituted in its present form in 1846, and its whole history since tended to show, not only that it was an Imperial and not a municipal concern, but that it was also really a branch of the Military Department, and ought properly to be placed on the Army Estimates. He did not think it was insignificant to note in this connection that the present head of the Dublin Metropolitan Police and the chief inspector were retired soldiers. He thought the right hon. Gentleman himself had reason to feel uncomfortable in regard to his conduct of this extraordinary force, and that from his own point of view, as well as from that of Nationalist Members, he ought to see that something was done to put the matter on a better basis. As he had said there was no comparison between the city of London and a city like Dublin, and any attempt to make one must necessarily be fallacious. He would, therefore, for the purpose of comparison, take the case of the city of Sheffield and compare it with that of Dublin. He had the figures prepared by the Corporation of Dublin to support the protest which they were now making and had made for many years past, against this indefensible system. The population of Dublin was, roughly speaking, 390,000, and the population of Sheffield was 480,000, so that there were more people in Sheffield than in Dublin. For the purposes of comparison, however, the numbers might be taken as being about the same. He did not think that any Member of the House would maintain that Sheffield was a more peaceable and law-abiding city than the city of Dublin; yet for Dublin the cost of the police was, at the lowest estimate, between £120,000 and £140,000, while in Sheffield it was between £55,000 and £60,000. The cost of the police in Dublin, however, was understated by his hon. friend the Member for North Meath, who said the total cost for the present year was £151,440; but, as a matter of fact, his hon. friend had omitted to include an item of £14,000, and the cost of the police force including the sum received from local contributions and grants in aid amounted to practically £170,000. Therefore, it worked out in this way: the cost of the police force in Sheffield being between £55,000 and £60,000, that amount was about one third of what it cost to maintain the police establishment in Dublin. Let him put the case in another way, and say that, if the Imperial contributions to the Dublin police force were swept away, they would find that the local contributions to it were equal to, if not in excess of, the cost of the police of the city of Sheffield. Then again, let the Committee consider the question of the source from which the local revenue of the Dublin police came. It was derived from a statutory tax not imposed by the Dublin Corporation in dealing with the interests of the citizens, but imposed by statute to the extent of eightpence in the pound upon the valuation. In spite of the many reverses with which they had to deal Dublin did not stand still but progressed; but, however much Dublin progressed from the point of view of valuation, the police force remained fixed at the same number, while the sum available for them was, by the increase of the valuation, very largely added to. He should say that within the last fifty years the valuation of Dublin, although he had not the precise figure, had risen by at least £300,000, and upon every single pound of that sum the citizens had been paying eightpence for the upkeep of the police. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman had caught the full significance of the figures which had been brought to his attention by his right hon. friend the Lord Mayor of Dublin. On the previous day, at a meeting of the Blackrock Urban District Council, the district of Blackrock being involved in this expenditure for the Dublin police, it had been said that the Council had written to the officials, not to protest against the tax, not to make any objection to it, but simply to ask for some explanation as to the principle upon which the local contribution of £54,000 was demanded and spent. As he was informed, the responsible officials of the Irish Government wrote back declining to give one single figure. He thought he was justified in interpreting the previous observations of the Chief Secretary to mean that he would give an undertaking that the officials of Dublin Castle should not in future be permitted to return a reply of that character to the representatives of so important a district as Blackrock. As he had said, the amount raised by local taxation was derived from this statutory and unchangeable rate of eightpence in the pound on the valuation, and it appeared to be as immutable as the laws of the Medes and Persians which altered not. He found from last year's report of the Dublin Metropolitan Police that they received money from other sources than those he had mentioned. It was a very small income, it was true; still it was an income. For instance, it was reported that two sovereigns were received by drivers of hackney carriages in mistake for silver coins, and no less a sum than £8 1s. 5d. was found in hackney carriages and surrendered to the police. So far as he knew, the police, with their characteristic habit of clinging to money, had not surrendered these amounts to anybody else. If the Committee would do a very simple sum they would find that the average salary of the Dublin police worked out at £120 to £125 a year, a salary which was handsome compared with that received by persons in other branches of the Government service—men who had to pass a stiff examination, such as principals of national schools. Again, if the Estimates were looked over, the Committee would find that the Vote for the maintenance of the force was not only to maintain the actual and active force, but a great part of it was devoted to retired members of the force. Thus, they had two Commissioners on the active list and two Commissioners on the retired list; there were seven superintendents on the active list and nine on the retired list; there were twenty-four inspectors on the active list and forty-three on the retired list; so that there were more superintendents and inspectors on the retired than on the active list. If the ages of the retirement of these people were looked into it would be found that the average age of retirement was fifty-three, and sometimes they retired on a salary of nearly £300—to be exact, £266 13s. 4d. Retiring at that age, and with such an income, there was nothing to prevent these men reading for a professorial chair. So far as he knew, the large number of police in the streets of Dublin was to restrain and suppress the riot and disorder created by the students of Trinity College, Dublin. That was the only justification he could see for the maintenance of this force. He hoped, however, a new spirit was penetrating every department of life in Ireland, and he trusted that even the students would put off the old Adam and make it possible to have a smaller police force. Another question to which he wished to call attention was the allowances made to the police force in addition to their full salary. This referred to the men in the G Division, humorously described as the detective division. These allowances were, in his opinion, excessive. In conclusion he would recapitulate the points which he had raised. The most significant one was that this force was entirely removed from the control of the citizens of Dublin, and they did not know whose control it was under or who was responsible for it. Secondly, if the cost was compared with that of a city which was not less criminal, say Sheffield, they found that the latter was a third or a quarter of the cost of the Dublin police. Some remarks had been made about the conduct and *personnel* of the Dublin Metropolitan Police Force, and to a large extent he agreed with those remarks. These men were the victims rather than the creatures of this evil system, and he thought the Dublin police very respectable and, when they went into the witness-box, very sober citizens. What he complained of was the system under which the members of the force became intimidated or demoralised. Let the Committee take, for instance, a circular which had been issued by the officials, he had no doubt with a sinister motive, calling for a Return of the number of members of the force who had not during the preceding three months made five arrests. The significance of that circular was that any policeman who failed to make or to manufacture at least five charges in three months was in disgrace. If that was not what the circular meant he did not know what it did mean. The fact was the police of the city of Dublin were merely ornamental and, for practical purposes, useless. This, with other abuses, must be swept away, and the principle should be laid down that the people of Ireland should be trusted and not distrusted. The military character of the force should be eliminated, and the police placed under the control of the Lord Mayor and the Corporation of the City of Dublin.

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

CLASS II.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £24,568, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland."

*MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory) said he rose to move the reduction of the Vote by £100 in order to call attention to the conduct of the Board of Works in regard to several matters. First of all, he had to complain of the constitution of the board; secondly, of its inefficiency; and, thirdly, of the way in which it dealt with its employees. The board consisted of three members, the chairman receiving a salary of £1,500 a year, and the two Commissioners £1,200 each, while the secretary,also received a substantial salary. He did not know that these gentlemen had any special qualifications for the posts they held, and he hoped the Government would inform them what their qualifications were. He did not know of any qualifications being possessed by the chairman except that he happened to be the brother of the Treasury Remembrancer, while another member of the board was an importation from this country who had been "dumped down" in Dublin, and no doubt left his country for his country's good. The qualification of one of the Commissioners was that he happened to be private secretary to the right hon. Member for Dover when he was Chief Secretary for Ireland. Of course he knew it was the privilege of private secretaries of Ministers to be placed in fat positions in Ireland, but he objected to it. The Board of Works was a purely nominated body, non-Irish in its sympathies, wholly irresponsible, and beyond the control of the Irish Government. There was positively no body in Ireland that could call the Board of Works to account. The Chief Secretary himself had no control over it, nor had any other Irish authority, and the board was represented in the House by a junior member of the Government, who declined to answer Questions on this or any other subject. The Estimates provided for this extraordinary board a sum of £40,568, an increase of £630 over last year. Duties had been entrusted to this body of the most important and far-reaching character, including the maintenance and erection of piers and harbours, Government buildings, and other public works, the care of public parks, arterial drainage, the administration of the Labourers Acts, and the preservation of ancient monuments. The fishing industry was of far-reaching importance to Ireland, but it was languishing, and those engaged in it were half starved and carried their lives in their hands while getting in and out of harbour. Those who visited Clew Bay would see that Mulranny Pier could be approached neither from the land nor from the sea by the fishermen; and the same sort of thing might be seen all round the coast of Ireland, north, south, east, and west. The harbours and piers were standing monuments of the blundering incapacity of the Board of Works. He had mentioned Mulranny Pier, but they had only to go to Arklow, Wicklow, and Greystones, and all round the coast, to see the evidence of failure on the part of the Board of Works. Arklow and the harbours he had mentioned were silting up. No vessel of any size could enter or leave them except at certain states of the tide, and then only with great risk. The piers were crumbling into the sea; and all this was through the pig-headed attitude of the Board of Works. Money had been laid out on those harbours, but without reference to local opinion. It was this disregard of local opinion in reference to local wants which made the people of Ireland despair. The Department consulted experts, made measurements, and obtained estimates and plans, but it omitted to do the one thing essential, and that was to consult the local fishermen, who were acquainted with every turn of the tide, and knew where they wanted protection and where a pier ought to be erected. Then with regard to the question of arterial drainage. There had been a report of the Commission on Arterial Drainage; it had been signed unanimously by the members of the Commission, who wound up by saying that they endorsed what had been stated by previous Commissions, one a Royal Commission, that the state of the rivers and waterways of Ireland was deplorable. Hon. Members from Ulster knew about the Bann. His own interest in the Bann was this. Whenever the Barrow drainage was mentioned, the question of the Bann was always introduced as a bone of contention, or drawn as a red herring across the scent. So far as he was concerned he had not the slightest objection to the land around the Bann being drained; he would like to see it as dry as the floor of the House of Commons; but he objected to the name of the Bann being introduced when the interests of Barrow drainage were being discussed, as a reason for not carrying out the Barrow works. He did not want to see the Battle of the Boyne fought over again between the Bann and the Barrow. There had been £150,000 laid out upon the Bann, and, as far as his information went, the money might as well have been thrown into Lough Neagh, so far as any benefit had accrued from the expenditure. They meant to persevere in their demand for a Barrow drainage scheme which the Commission had pointed out was reasonable, and they meant to see whether the position could not be improved with State assistance. But there was one thing remarkable about the district of the Barrow, and it was that the people there steadfastly refused that a single sixpence of the money to be granted should be laid out by the Board of Works. They had at present a machinery in the local county councils, who could carry out the work satisfactorily and in a manner that would meet the views of those in whose interest the work was undertaken and who would have to pay a large portion of the cost. Then there was the question of the schools. The hon. Member for East Mayo had been asking questions for the last two years as to the plans for schools, and the reply had been that the plans were not yet complete. It meant that plans of only ordinary schools were required, plans such as a local architect would get out in twenty-four hours; yet it had taken the Board of Works two years, and the plans were not yet forthcoming, though the money had been granted. The clashing of authority between different Boards was quite extraordinary. There was a case in Clare where the Board of Works claimed the right to lay out certain money; another Department claimed an equal right, and so, in presence of this cat and dog existence, the work was not carried out. With regard to ancient monuments they had fallen on bad times when they were handed over to the tender mercies of the Board of Works. These ancient monuments were relics which the Irish people regarded with pride and veneration. They were indications of the culture and civilisation which existed in their country many centuries ago, when

England was merely emerging from the darkness of barbarism, and when Birmingham was only a squalid village. He now came to the last phase of the subject. He had put questions to the Secretary to the Treasury, who had not answered some of them, and it was not in his power to force the hon. Gentleman to give replies. The questions were as to the religious creeds of the staff. He had been informed that the Board of Works never asked about the creed of members of the staff. Oh, no; no one knew anything about the religion of anyone else in a Government Department in Ireland. He had some facts and figures to which he would direct the attention of the Committee. It showed something about the general working of the Board of Works in respect of its dealing with the staff. In the first place, in the Boards of Works, of which Mr. Henry Williams was Secretary and the ruling spirit, the number of nominated appointments filled by Catholics was fifty, and their salaries amounted to £9,793. The number of nominated appointments filled by members of other denominations was eighty-four, and their salaries amounted to £26,609. The nominated appointments were in the hands of the Secretary, Mr. Williams, and his triumvirate, and of course, they were told that these gentlemen knew nothing whatever about creeds. If they took the question of open competition and appointments on merit, they found that the Catholics took about two-thirds of the posts and more than half the salaries. In regard to appointments by open competition the Catholics held thirty-seven places, the salaries of which amounted to £6,712, whilst other denominations held twenty-three places, the total of which amounted to £6,465. That was a clear indication that the nominated appointments were made not by merit but by favouritism. Religion ought to be set aside in all these matters, but they could not close their eyes to facts and figures of this kind when they saw their countrymen being deprived of their rightful share of these positions. He would not be doing justice to his fellow countrymen if he did not demand that they should get their fair share of appointments under the Board. In the case of nominated appointments the average Catholic salary was £189, whilst the non-Catholic salary averaged £309. The manner in which the Board dealt with Catholics in Dublin was notorious. If a member of the Catholic body holding a position under the Board happened to be ill and was laid up, an old pensioner was despatched to see whether he was malingering or telling untruths. On the other hand, if a member of another denomination said he was ill no such inquiries would be made, and he might whilst off duty go to Phœnix Park or attend the races, and nothing would be said about it. That kind of thing was well known in Dublin, and he did not need to press the matter further. Whilst this Board would not allow a piece of ground for the Gaelic Football Club or the Gaelic League, they were quite willing to set apart thirty acres of the most beautiful part of Phœnix Park to be used by the Polo Club. The figures he had given were incontestable and could not be denied. This autocratic non-representative body was not satisfied with the large nominating power it now possessed, and they had applied to the Civil Service Commissioners for extended powers. He wished to enter his protest against the penalising of any official who might have given information to a Member of Parliament. It would be a horrible state of things if this intimidating of the staff was allowed to be continued without being exposed. What were the facts? No sooner did the information he alluded to reach the public than a threatening note was posted up in the Board of Works Offices in the following terms—

"It has been observed by the Board that an article concerning promotion in this Department appeared in two Dublin newspapers on Thursday and Friday last.

"So far as this article relates to matters of public knowledge the Board are not concerned. It contained, however, certain statements which were based upon information that could only have been furnished directly or indirectly by persons within the office. It will therefore be necessary for the Secretary to bring again to the notice of all Divisions the stringent Treasury Circular on the subject of giving information to the Press.

"The communication referred to is calculated, as the Board think most undeservedly, to cast a stigma on the staff, but they wish to take this opportunity of stating that they have every confidence in the loyalty of the officials of the Department, and they feel sure that the latter will share their great regret that there should be any individual or individuals among them who should have proved themselves untrue to the rules and traditions of the public service."

That Board would become another Chamber of Horrors and nothing would be allowed to come out of it if hon. Members of this House were not permitted to receive the information which was necessary to expose this notorious Board. They had no less than sixty-seven Boards in Ireland, and the late Mr. Davitt used to call them the forty thieves, although he under-estimated their number at the time. There were now sixty-seven Boards in Ireland and therefore there must be sixty-seven thieves, and the Board of Works was the worst. So bad was the system that it was past mending, and for the sake of administration and civil and religious liberty in Ireland the Board should be abolished. He moved the reduction of the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £24,468, be granted for the said Service."—(*Mr. Delany.*)

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.) dissociated himself from the grossly unfair attack which had been made on the Board of Works, and, so far as it was based on information which appeared to have been purloined from a Government office by a clerk in its employment, he disclaimed all sympathy with it. He hoped this kind of leakage would be discovered and punished as severely as the rules of any healthy Civil Service demanded. It was intolerable that there should be prying into these matters for the purpose of advancing a man's personal interests and making through Parliament or the Press or otherwise unworthy or cowardly attacks on his superiors. He hoped it would be discovered who had done this, and the Secretary to the Treasury would have the most cordial support of his hon. friends in maintaining the honourable traditions of the Civil Service, which ought to be carried out in Ireland in the same way as in England. His experience of the Board of Works was that they were not infallible. That had never been claimed for them, and he did not feel called upon to defend them. He assumed that the Ministry under which they were at present serving would see that justice was done to them. He knew from personal experience that the Board of Works had an exceedingly able and obliging staff of inspectors, who went through the country making advances for the improvement of the land. He did not think that any man who had had dealings with the Board of Works had any reasonable complaint to make. He certainly thought that the Government should take one matter into consideration, viz., the enabling of the Board to make smaller loans than they could do at present. He understood that at present they could not advance less than £50. That was measured by a certain number of years rental of the farm on which the improvement was to be made. Many small holders would often be glad to avail themselves of smaller loans—say £35—but the Board had no authority to make such advances. If they could not do it as the law stood it was a matter for which they could not be blamed. The hon. Member had complained of favouritism and bigotry of the Board of Works, and said that these complaints were common property in Dublin. If that were so, they were common to a particular class, and he could not say that he shared in them. He wished again to call attention to the Bann Drainage question which had been pressed on the attention of the Government for many years. The counties on the seaboard had had a great deal done for them in the way of piers and grants. He and his friends were not grudging that expenditure, which had amounted to about £400,000. But the Bann stood out from what might be called these marine questions. The question of the Bann affected five inland counties. While places on the seaboard had had their share of money—he did not say that they had had enough yet—these inland counties, which were all vitally affected by the flooding of the Bann, had not yet received adequate consideration. The money already found for the draining of the Bann had been found through Imperial credit which was only possible under the present Constitution, and would be impossible if they ever arrived at separation. That money was found in the days before the internal drainage of the country was so largely developed, as it had been in the last two generations. Formerly the Bann was adequate to bring down drainage from the whole watershed, but now the same quantity of water reached the river in twenty-four hours, whereas formerly it took a week or ten days. He was not suggesting that the original works were completely adequate, and, as a matter of fact, the original design for the Bann had never been carried out. What had been done for the Bann in the past had been done by borrowed money, and every penny had since been repaid by the people who got the benefit in their districts, and they were still paying maintenance charges. There had been no loss to the Treasury for any sum expended on the Bann. He recognised that this question was in a sense *sub judice* at present, because since the last Bill dealing with the matter—a Bill which passed the Second Reading, but failed to pass through Committee—there had been two different inquiries and reports as to the state of affairs. The first of these reports proposed an expenditure of £150,000, of which £100,000 had to be subscribed locally. That was an absolute bar to the scheme, because only the people interested would consent to raise the money, and it was impossible for them to raise so much. His right hon. friend the Member for South Dublin when Chief Secretary, sent down Sir Alexander Binnie, a distinguished engineer, who reported on the state of the lough and the river in 1905. He estimated the cost at £75,000—just half of the previous estimate. He understood that the present Government were prepared to deal with the question when fuller inquiry had been made. He admitted that the pledge given was a general one, and he did not wish to push it further than that. During the last six months inspectors, on behalf of the Board of Works, had been through the district making a valuation of the lands, extending to sixty miles of territory, which would be benefited by the drainage operations. He wished to ask in no controversial spirit if these inquiries had terminated and what had been the result. He wished also to know if the Government were now in a position to say what action they proposed to take. He and his friends were quite prepared to wait a reasonable time in order that the Government might make all necessary inquiry into the matter. The population in the districts concerned was growing, and he was sure that the Government would not minimise the importance of the matter.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.) said the hon. Member who had just spoken seemed to think that they wanted information about the Board of Works. What was wanted was criticism of the Board. They had got enough information. He was one of those individuals who whether as a Nationalist fighting for the Nationalist cause on the hillsides, or in addressing meetings in England, had never made creed or class a question in discussing Irish government. He and his friends did not believe in introducing either Protestantism or Catholicism. They believed that Irishmen should have a full share in the government of their own country, and he hoped that the course of events in the near future would result in the realisation of this view. He did not wish to criticise any official connected with the Board of Works. His object in rising was to deal with the Board of Works as at present constituted, and as one of the numerous Departments which misgoverned Ireland. He made no attack upon any official, but he did say that the Board of Works had failed to discharge the duties and the functions for which it was supposed to exist. The Board of Works was connected with almost all the public works in Ireland. If a national school house was to be erected a Board of Works inspector came down to inspect it. If there was a local drainage scheme to be carried out, a Board of Works Inspector would come down and run the whole concern. If a poor farmer in the North, East, West, or South of Ireland wanted to borrow money to improve his farm—say £100—according to the rules of the Board of Works the money was lent to him to be paid back by instalments as the work proceeded. Very good. It was a matter of life and death to the small farmer that he should carry out his improvements, and pay regularly the instalments of the loan, principal, and interest, within a certain number of years. The inspector of the Board of Works came down with his monocle in his eye, and, supposing the farmer who had spent the whole of his life in doing the best for his land, could not pay his instalment at the moment, this monocled inspector would say, " This instalment must be paid immediately and not indefinitely postponed." Personally, he had never found fault in the House with the officials of any Department. He only found fault with the Department itself. A local contractor tendered for the erection of a National school for a certain amount of money. He might be a poor man without capital, but his brother might be a smith and his son a carpenter, and he undertook the erection of the schoolhouse under the supervision of the inspector of the Board of Works, provided he got periodical payments as the work proceeded. The Board of Works inspector came down, and found some technical objection to a part of the job, and refused to grant a certificate for the money to the poor contractor. All these things were, however, minor matters compared with arterial drainage. In that regard he would remind the Committee that the Unionist Member for Armagh held exactly the same views as those to which he had given expression, when he said on May 24th, 1905, that Ireland was dominated by the incapacity of the Board of Works. He was at one with his hon. friend above the gangway. Could he be blamed, therefore, for putting in a word in favour of the drainage of the Oranmore river, which was not a navigable river but one the drainage of the basin of which affected 8,000 farmers? He spoke in regard to this question on behalf not only of the Nationalists, but of the Unionists and clergy of all denominations in the County of Sligo. He maintained that considerable drainage works would have long ago been done in the West of Ireland if the Board of Works had been efficient. He hoped the Government would devote more attention not to the great navigable rivers, but to the smaller rivers of the West of Ireland.

*Mr. HUGH LAW (Donegal, W.) made reference to a dredger which had been provided under the provisions of the Marine Works Act of 1902, and asked what had been done with it. A number of harbours in Ireland were practically useless for traffic and trade owing to the silting up of sand. In his own constituency there were three harbours of this kind. The question of dredging had been mooted and had been the subject of correspondence between the local authorities and the Irish Government for four or five years, and he would like to know what was the state of the arrangements in regard to this dredger.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) thought that all the rivers ought to be drained, no matter in what part of Ireland they happened to be; but while everybody agreed that large districts ought to be drained, that operation was never performed, and apparently the rivers were never going to be drained. They had had seven or eight Commissions upon arterial drainage in Ireland, and yet a Commission was sitting now. Former Commissions had had no result, and he wondered whether the one now sitting would bring forth anything which would lead to action. This Vote was a very important one, as it raised many questions of interest, and he wanted both to ask for information and to criticise it. At present it appeared to him that the Board of Works in Ireland represented the English Treasury, and therefore Irish Nationalists had a great objection to the Vote. If however, the Board of Works represented the Irish Treasury hon. Members for Ireland would not object to it. So much by way of prelude, but he wished to call attention to the question of the preservation of ancient monuments, which to his mind was one of extreme importance. One of his hon. friends was not satisfied with the way in which the Board of Works had taken charge of ancient Irish monuments. He did not agree with that view; he thought that the manner in which the Board of Works had looked after certain Irish monuments was creditable and that they had done a great deal of good work. The only complaint made was that the Board of Works did not extend its sphere of usefulness and deal with a larger number of monuments. He would be glad if the Chief Secretary would find out for him how many ancient monuments had been vested in the Board of Works since the passing of the Act of 1903, and whether there existed any regular means of communication between the Estates Commissioners and the Board of Works, so that whenever a statue was deemed by local antiquaries to be worthy of preservation, steps could at once be taken in that direction. He thought they should follow the example of other countries which showed an admirable spirit in these matters. In certain parts of the country there were periodical invasions of tourists, and care should be taken to protect these monuments from injury. Then as to loans, he thought that the powers of the Board were too restricted, and that the Chief Secretary might well consider whether a smaller advance than £50 could be made, say £25. The latter sum would be a very useful loan. He thought the rate of interest, five or six per cent., was too heavy, and he would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he could not give people who borrowed through this Department the advantages which were given to other people. Again, there was the question of inspectors appointed by the Board. There were only ten or twelve of these gentlemen. They were appointed some twenty or thirty years ago under conditions which had since been modified. Since then other inspectors had been appointed who did nothing like the work which the older inspectors did and had been put under better conditions as regards pay and pension. He asked if something could not be done to better the conditions as regarded the pensions of the ten or twelve inspectors originally appointed, having regard to their long service. With regard to school grants, he asked whether the hon. Member could say when certain schools in his constituency, the preparation for building which was commenced four years ago, would be completed. He hoped the assurances given by the Chief Secretary some time ago would be carried out and this matter brought to an early conclusion. These schools were urgently needed, and it was not creditable to the authorities that so long a time should be allowed to elapse between the preparations to commence them and their completion. With regard to the question of fishing piers, it was interesting to recall the fact that the history of the Marine Works Act was that it was given to Ireland as a piece of great generosity; but the English had intercepted certain funds devoted to marine works in Ireland, and eventually of those funds, £100,000 was handed over for the purpose of building these piers and other marine works. How far had these funds been mortgaged or had they entirely disappeared, and how soon would the money be available for marine works and fishing piers in different parts of Ireland? The operation of the Marine Works Act should be extended, and, in view of the benefits which had accrued where it had been put into force, other districts should enjoy the same benefits. Would the hon. Member ascertain from the Board of Works whether they had any idea of the amount that would be required to construct marine works in the congested districts of Ireland and outside those districts where such works were required? There was one harbour in which he was particularly interested, and with regard to which he would like to have the information as soon as possible. Whenever the question of fishing harbours came up Greystones had a large claim for consideration, because of the large sums spent by Greystones upon the harbour, which unfortunately, had not been a success. He would also like to know how the Board of Works and the Department of Agriculture in Ireland were getting on, and whether they had settled the differences of opinion that had arisen between them with regard to certain marine works, and particularly with regard to Arklow harbour, and whether the works there would shortly be completed.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury) said complaint had been made by the hon. Member who moved the reduction that this Department was represented by him. He assured him that his regret on that head was no greater than his own. He was extremely sorry that he should have anything to do with the government of Ireland under the present conditions. They were, however, in hopes that alterations would be made shortly in that respect. This particularly applied to the Office of Works, because it covered such a very wide field, and when they attempted to find anything analagous to it in England they found that the Office of Works dealt with matters which in England were under the Commissioners of Works, the Board of Agriculture, the Board of Trade (the management of railways and so on), with matters controlled by the Public Works Loan Commissioners, and with a hundred and one other matters which in England were controlled by a hundred and one other bodies. Therefore, it was impossible for an Englishman with a short experience to have a knowledge of anything like all the questions that he had been asked on this occasion. He would try, however, to answer one or two of them as far as he could. As to work done in regard to ancient monuments since 1903, he could give no information off hand, but if the hon. Baronet would put a Question on the Paper he would give him all the information he could obtain upon the subject. With regard to loans, it had been suggested that they should be reduced from £50 to £25. He had been informed that the loans were now as low as £35 and that this was done by a Treasury Warrant. He would see what could be done, but it did not seem to him that the amount of benefit that would accrue from making the loan £10 lower would be very great. The hon. Member had also asked whether a larger amount could be advanced to farmers. That was a matter he would have to consider further. The hon. Member for Donegal had asked about the dredger. He would point out to him that it was the property of the Local Government Board, and if the hon. Gentleman would like to have it sent down to Donegal he would advise him to approach the Board in that regard. Donegal was not the only county in Ireland which would like to have the assistance of a dredger.

MR. HUGH LAW said he was not so anxious to have the Board of Works dredger, but *a* dredger. As he understood, there had been a triangular negotiation going on between the Board of Works, the Congested Districts Board, and the county council, and he was anxious on that account to know if the hon. Gentleman could give any information.

MR. RUNCIMAN said there was only one dredger, and that was at the disposal of any local authority, and if they would kindly let him know what dredging was going on, he would certainly do his best to facilitate the work. Reference had been made to the amount of money spent under the Marine Works Act. He could not exactly state what that sum was, but no doubt hon. Members would be satisfied if the amounts were stated in the form of a Return. He had also been asked some questions about Greystones pier, or rather what remained of it. The pier was of zig-zag shape, and was on all sorts of levels; it was of comparatively little use. He was not quite sure that the money had been spent wisely in building the pier, for there were other parts of Ireland which had as great a claim, and where the Government could have spent the money to better advantage. At all events, the pier was in a lamentable condition, and before he could say anything as to the future he would have to make inquiries of the authorities and advisers of the Board on the subject. With regard to Arklow, all the necessary formalities had been gone through and completed, and he hoped that the work would be pressed forward without any delay. As to Wicklow, the Board of Works were not responsible, for they had been practically told "hands off." He had also been asked as to whether plans for schools had reached anything like the final stage. His right hon. friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland had announced some time ago that negotiations had proceeded between the National Board and his own office, and the Treasury had now come to the conclusion that they ought to arrange for new plans to be designed on a basis much more generous than was allowed in either England or Scotland. He was sure that hon. Members from Ireland could not ask for more than that. The claim which had always been put forward was that there should be ten square feet per child on the mean between the average attendance and the number on the roll for each specific school. So far as that was concerned they had now reached a settlement, and there ought to be no delay. He had been asked why the Board of Works did not allow more football grounds in Phœnix Park. He was informed that there were no less than thirty-two football grounds allotted by the Board of Works, and he did not know many towns of the size of Dublin which had thirty-two public football grounds allotted by the public authorities. The story of the Bann was a very old one, but before proceeding with that matter he would remind hon. Members that very large sums of Imperial money had been spent on arterial drainage. The whole question of the drainage of the centre of Ireland was a very important one, and was by no means limited to the land which lay about the Bann. He was in Ireland some time ago with his right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board. They saw something of the condition of the centre of Ireland, and the knowledge then gained had been supplemented by much information gained by the Irish Office on this side of the water. That information pointed to the conclusion that unless something like £5,000,000 was spent on the internal drainage of Ireland, that country would never be thoroughly drained. Five millions was a very large sum, but doubtless the benefits of such a scheme might more than recoup them for a large part of the expenditure. But on such a big question as that, involving a sum of £5,000,000 or any large sum, it would be quite improper to commit the Government. The Bann, however, had one of the first claims on any sum that was to be spent. [AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Barrow?] It was impossible for them to decide as to whether the Bann or the Barrow would come first. What had to be done must be done with public money, and at very great expense. This was really a matter that must be dealt with along with others, and he could make no announcement on the subject of the drainage of the Bann except to say that the scheme which had been put forward had received, and was receiving, very serious consideration, and if it would bear criticism he had no doubt that something might be done upon it.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.): Has the local inquiry been concluded?

MR. RUNCIMAN believed that the local inspection by those who were testing the scheme on the spot had been concluded, but the whole matter was coming under the consideration of the Government. The hon. Member for Queen's County, Ossory, had made some reference to the Board of Works. He only wished the hon. Member had kept out of his speech the name of the distinguished gentleman who was at the head of the Board. However much the hon. Gentleman might dislike him he thought it would be as well in criticising the Board that he should follow the example of one of his hon. friends by criticising the Board as a whole, without criticising particular officials in it. Sir George Holmes had been on the Board of Works for some five or six years and had worked with the greatest energy. Possibly, during the whole of that time, he might have done some things which had not met with the approval of hon. Gentlemen on the other side. There were few public officials but at one time or another met with the censure of hon. Members, on one side of the House or the other, representing local interests. Sir George Holmes had dealt faithfully and well with the interests of the Board, and all he could say in his behalf at the present time would be quite inadequate as any return for his public services. The hon. Gentleman had made reference to a Question which he had put the other day, and which he (Mr. Runciman) had declined to answer. His reply was shortly this, that in regard to Sir G. Holmes the Question was based on information which was absolutely groundless, and that, as the hon. Gentleman had asked similar Questions on several occasions, he thought it only right, in defence of officials who were attacked, to say that he deprecated those Questions, and that he thought it most derogatory to the dignity and the honour of those officials that he should have to get up time after time to say that there was no ground for the accusation made against them. He was sure the hon. Gentleman would agree with him that he was at all times ready to give proper information, and if the hon. Member's Questions were not couched in a form which was really intolerable to those who were serving the public interest, he would be very glad to give all the information he could. The hon. Gentleman had made reference to a letter which he said was received by the Board of Works from the Civil Service Commissioners with reference to the religious beliefs of the staff of the Board of Works. This also had been the subject of a Question by the hon. Member, and he had told him at the time that no such letter had been received, for the simple reason that the Civil Service Commissioners had never written such a letter. Whatever might be said of them, he ventured to think that the Commissioners took no part whatever in Irish politics, and he was assured by a member of the staff of the Civil Service Commission that no such letter ever was written, nor, so far as he could gather, had such a letter been sent from any other Department of the State. As to the notice which had been circulated in reference to information which had leaked out from time to time on matters concerning the staff, that notice was not peculiar to Ireland; they sometimes had them in England, for the very good reason that those who were serving the public interest must be well aware that any disclosure of what passed in their office was a very grave breach of confidence; and he thought that hon. Gentlemen must see really how improper it would be that communications of a confidential nature passing from one department to another, should become public. If such a thing were allowed to take place it would be impossible to conduct any public department with any sense of security. He did not suggest for a moment that anything improper passed between these two departments. He did not think that anything did; and he doubted that the disclosures would have done any harm to anyone. But he wanted to point out that correspondence passing between one department and another must be secret. Distinguished servants of the State, who had gone through every department both in England and abroad, would be the first to acknowledge that this was a rule that could not be departed from, and that any notice which maintained that standard was one which ought to be observed by the staff. The hon. Gentleman had made an allegation against the Board of Works as to the preference given to Protestants in that department. It was always a difficult matter to inquire into the religious belief of those who were serving in a public department. So far as the Catholics were concerned, he would be among the first to deprecate and to punish severely any attempt to handicap them in the public service of Ireland. But he could not say there was any evidence of undue preference of the men of one creed over the men of another. He would like to amplify that. There had been particular accusations against the Secretary of the Board of Works, who was himself a Protestant. The hon. Gentleman had been good enough to send him some information with regard to the staff of the Board of Works. He had experienced the greatest difficulty in finding out what were the religious beliefs of the staff, and from what he had seen he gathered that there were under Mr. Williams more Catholics than Protestants. He had no means of checking that information. He would venture to suggest that if Mr. Williams was accused of being prejudiced against Catholics, the mere fact that there were more Catholics than Protestants in his office was surely a very good reply.

MR. DELANY said what he had pointed out was that the Catholics had only £9,000 in salaries, while the Protestants had over £26.000.

MR. RUNCIMAN said there was in the Department mentioned a very large sprinkling of Catholics, so large in fact that in the higher ranks nearly one-half were Catholics. It was true that if they added up the salaries they would find that those who were Protestants would be earning more than the Catholics, but there were ways of adding up tables which would make the very best things look uncommonly bad. He would like to suggest one explanation of the facts stated by the hon. Gentleman opposite. It so happened that those in the higher ranks were principally Protestants whilst those in the lower ranks were Catholics. The explanation he would offer of that was that higher education in Ireland had handicapped the Catholics and placed them at a great disadvantage. When Ireland extended University facilities and a large number of Catholics, and not Protestants only, were able to take advantage of University education, no doubt the balance would be restored, and it would be found that education and not religion was the qualification for admitting men into these positions. Nothing was more lamentable in the history of Ireland than the way that country was divided up by two political parties and by two religious beliefs. This was not understandable by those who had spent all their public life in England. He hoped the time was coming when the Irish people would be able to work together without religious difficulties interfering with their public duties. In conclusion he reminded the Committee of the two statements made by Disraeli, who when asked what his religion was, said-

> "My religion is the religion of all sensible men,"

and when asked what that was, replied—

> "Sensible men never tell."

He hoped the time was coming when in the appointment of public servants, whether under the present or a future *régime*, it would not be necessary to inquire what were the religious beliefs of any of them.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR (Kildare, N.) said they all wished the hon. Gentleman every success in his new office, and they fully recognised that he had made every effort to grasp the complicated situation in Ireland with which he had to deal. Quite recently he had had to master all the finance of the Land Act, and they all knew with what success he had achieved that result, and how he was able to answer any question upon that involved subject. The hon. Member had discoursed quite lucidly upon one of the most complicated problems of Irish government, viz., the Board of Works. Evidently the hon. Gentlemen who usually sat above the gangway were satisfied, because they had left the House. The Bann would in their opinion overflow its banks no more, because the hon. Gentleman above the gangway had spoken. The Financial Secretary to the Treasury had stated that the Government had inquired into the subject, and were still inquiring, and would continue to inquire, but he (Mr. O'Connor) doubted whether the Bann would be any better for that inquiry. It was his lot two days ago to introduce a subject with which the Board of Works was very seriously concerned. He referred to the arterial drainage of Ireland. They had heard nothing at all about the competency of this Department to deal with the two important subjects of the building of schools and arterial drainage in Ireland. The subject which had been raised by his hon. friend was the competency or the incompetency of the Board of Works. Not one word had escaped the hon. Gentleman's lips as to whether he was convinced that the Department was capable or incapable of executing those works. The Commissioners of National Education had stated in their very last Report that it would take £500,000 for five years to put them in the position they might have occupied if they had been fairly dealt with for the last four years. But not a stone had been laid and not one act of reparation had been done to those schools, because the Treasury had shut up its pockets and closed its purse. It had been said by the Chief Secretary that £1,000,000 was absolutely necessary to put the schools of Ireland in a proper condition. Was the Board of Works a competent body to expend that money? Instead of granting £500,000 a miserable £40,000 a year for three years was to be granted. That was a most contemptible sum having regard to the admission that had been made. What he wished the hon. Gentleman to answer was whether the Board of Works, about the competency of which he had said not a single word, was competent to expend £40,000 a year for the next three years. He trusted that the hon. Member would occupy many an onerous office in the present Government. He was now qualifying, in one of the most difficult positions it was possible for even a gentleman of his unbounded industry to occupy, for one of those high positions which his talents entitled him to fill in the future. He knew that the hon. Gentleman had a long and brilliant career before him, and he would go from office to office, and before he had scarcely mastered the details of his present office he would no doubt receive promotion and find himself in the Cabinet. He would not grudge his advancement at all, because he desired that every young man of industry who desired to serve his country in honourable occupations should have the opportunity of doing so. With regard to arterial drainage in Ireland the hon. Member had said that when he looked into this Department he found there had been a very great deal of neglect. They had had placed before them the question of the Bann versus the Barrow. If the Treasury and the Board of Works decided to spend more money on the Bann he desired it and he would not object. The Barrow flowed through his constituency and had done so for the past 100 years without any money being expended upon it. During that period it had overflowed its banks four times a year and not a penny had been spent upon it. The Bann had been thoroughly neglected. Report after report had been issued with regard to it and they had not been acted upon. The question was raised by the predecessor of the hon. Member for North Armagh, the late Colonel Saunderson, who had always supported the Nationalist

Party on this question of arterial drainage. On one occasion an engineer was sent down to report upon the Bann. The very next year another complaint was made and another engineer was sent down who also reported. Why were all these reports necessary? Because of the incompetency of the Board of Works. One engineer after another had produced schemes for the drainage of the Bann; they had been presented to the Board of Works, and under that body they had proved total failures. When he moved a Motion upon this subject not very long ago he was told that perhaps another authority could be established for dealing with arterial drainage, and the appointment of a Commission was suggested, and the late Chief Secretary the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Dublin jumped at the suggestion. He said, "Let us have another Commission." He did not support that suggestion but the Commsssion was appointed. It was a way of shelving the difficulty. He was invited last year to give evidence before the Commission upstairs. He told Sir Alexander Binnie that he had not supported the appointment of the Commission. He reminded Sir Alexander that he himself had reported on the Bann the year before, and that another engineer had reported on the same subject the year before that. He told him further that the Commission was utterly unneeded, and he produced in support of that statement the Reports which had been presented to Parliament for the last 100 years. The evidence amounted to thousands upon thousands of pages, and he said, "Great Heaven! What do you want with another Commission?" They had the Reports of all the Commissions which had taken evidence for the past 100 years, and what was the result? Absolutely no result, except that some money had been spent on the Bann through the influence of hon. Gentlemen above the gangway, money which might as well have been pitched into the Thames for all the good it had done to the Bann. The Bann was in a worse condition to-day than before a penny was expended upon it. He made that statement on the authority of the Reports to which he referred. They all condemned the schemes carried out by the Board of Works, and that was the Board they were now criticising. It was the Board that would have to carry out the works for the further drainage of the Bann. Hon. Members above the gangway had made their speeches which would be published in the local newspapers, and on the 12th of July they would be cheered because they spoke about the Bann in the House of Commons. The Treasury would still be considering the Report of this Commission, and not a single thing would be done to give effect to the recommendations. The Financial Secretary had answered all the questions in a perfunctory sort of way, but he had not spoken one word in regard to the Board which the Nationalist Members declared were incompetent to carry out any works with which they might be entrusted. When his hon. friend the Member for the Ossory Division complained of the *personnel* of the Board he was lectured severely by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury. But his hon. friend lived in the district affected by these works, and he knew how the health of the people was injured by the overflowing of the banks. These were the people who would have to bear the cost of the works if carried out, and it was natural that his hon. friend should press his case with as much force and energy as he could employ. The two questions of arterial drainage and education in Ireland had been recognised by the Chief Secretary as calling for attention. In the speeches which the right hon. Gentleman delivered he had dwelt on these important subjects as illustrating the appalling neglect by the British Government of the affairs of Ireland. He read with profit and with hope every utterance of the right hon. Gentleman, whether made in England or in Ireland, and he observed with the keenest delight that he had got a full grasp of the wants of the people of the country. If they could impress upon him and the Financial Secretary to the Treasury that the position of the Board of Works called for investigation, this debate would not have been in vain. He hoped the debate would not be lost on the Financial Secretary. He was certain it would not be lost on the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and in another year's time he believed they would have another story to tell than the sad one which had been related by his hon. friends.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.) said he was glad that this debate had taken place, if only for the purpose of calling the attention of the Liberal Party and of the Ministry to the necessity of doing something in the way of enabling the Irish people within a reasonable time to have the management of their own local affairs. The hon. Member for North Armagh had stated that no man in Ireland at present had any reason to complain of the action of the Board of Works in dealing with small farmers who applied for loans to carry out useful improvements. He thought he would be able to satisfy the hon. Member that great difficulties were sometimes thrown in the way of small farmers who applied for loans. He had in his possession a shoal of letters which had passed between a small farmer in his neighbourhood and the Board of Works in the past twelve months. That man acquired his holding under the Ashborne Act and applied for a loan of £55. In due course an engineer was sent down by the Board to make inquiries as to the works proposed to be carried out. The farmer informed the engineer that he intended to carry out the works with the aid of his own children. They had been assisting other farmers, and it occurred to him that the loan might be utilised in paying them wages in carrying out the works which he desired. The engineer reported to the Board of Works what the farmer proposed to do, and the Board declined to give the loan because he wished to carry out the works with the assistance of his own children. He thought that was a monstrous state of things. He himself had taken up the case and represented to the Board of Works that it was very unfair not to make the loan, but the Board insisted that they were justified in refusing it. A short time ago they instituted proceedings against this unfortunate man for applying for the loan, and, a decree having been given against him, he had actually to pay for making the application. That was the most extraordinary thing he had ever heard of in connection with the action of any Board.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the Clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

LOWER THAMES TUNNEL RAILWAYS BILL (BY ORDER).

Second Reading deferred till Thursday next.

SUPPLY (CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES).

Postponed Proceeding on Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £24,468, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland."—(*Mr. Delany,*)—resumed.

MR. DUFFY, resuming his remarks, asked what had been done by the Board of Works in regard to the port of Kinvara. A sum of £1,100 had been set apart for Kinvara, out of the grant made to the Board of Works to improve the ports of Ireland, while the Board of Agriculture and other Boards had made advances, making altogether about £2,000. But what had been done in improving the harbour since 1902? He understood that the Board of Works had carried out a portion of the work, and undertook to spend the sum of £1,900 on the construction of a pier. They had spent £1,369, but he wanted to know whether they had got value for the money. He had received many inquiries as to whether the rest of the money was to be handed over to the county council to carry out the remainder of the work. When was the Government going to take action with the view of allowing the county council to spend its own money? He was informed that the County Council of Galway had approved of the plans for the improvement of the harbour so long ago as 1905; but he had received complaints from his constituents that nothing had been done in regard to that particular harbour and making it accessible to boats. It was the bounden duty of the Government to step in and insist on the county council spending the money allocated in improving the harbour.

MR. J. P. NANNETTI called attention to the wages paid to the men employed in the public parks in Dublin. These men were only paid from 14s. to 16s. per week, and the rate of living in Dublin was as high as in London, where the men were paid 24s. or more per week. Of course many men in these times were anxious to accept any wage offered in order to keep the wolf from the door.

MR. RUNCIMAN said he could assure the hon. Gentleman that inquiry would be made in regard to the point raised by him. He himself considered that a full-grown man should be paid a living wage.

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question, "That a sum, not exceeding £24,568, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1908, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of Public Works in Ireland," put, and agreed to.

3. £46,411, to complete the sum for Local Government Board, Ireland.

MR. GINNELL (Westmeath, N.) said that if the Irish Boards were to be radically improved and put under popular control as the Boards in Great Britain were, they in Ireland were willing to address themselves in the future to the practical work of carrying out the improvement of local public works. If they in Ireland had the making and administration of their own lands there would be sufficient work for them to do and they might be able to draw a veil of decency over the putrid corpse of the past. Many hon. Members had not taken the opportunity of expressing an opinion upon this subject, perhaps because of the coming measure which directly related to the Vote before the Committee. He might be permitted to say in a single sentence that the right hon. Gentleman must not be surprised, or take it as a reflection upon himself if some in Ireland, remembering the past and reading the forecasts and repeated statements that this Bill was in substance only a rehash of the despised and despicable thing concocted a few years ago by Unionist authors, reserved their opinion and their freedom of action with regard to his measure until they had studied it in print. Of course there was a possibility that his Bill might be found such as the Irish people could accept with safety and honour. In that spirit he abstained from going into the shady details of the Vote before the Committee. He might point out however that the Local Government Board for Ireland cost £92,411 while the corresponding Board for Scotland cost only £15,887, a fact which was in itself so striking and significant that comment would spoil it. Everybody knew and admitted that instead of being governed six times better, Ireland was governed at least fifty times worse than Scotland. The ways in which the Board managed to spend all this money had been criticised, year after year, with no substantial result. The more expensive an institution was, the greater the number and influence of those who drew a living from it, and who would defend it as their very lives, which no doubt it was. Although this horde of carrion had been quartered upon them in Ireland against their will, even if they had the making and administration of their own laws to-morrow he supposed they would be obliged to pension the carrion. So it would be many long years before they could thank Heaven that they were rid of them. Every year the Chief Secretary for the time being promised reforms in some branch of the services. If those promises or even a tenth of them had been acted upon they should have little to complain of to-day. Why, for instance, with an almost omnipotent Government in power, had not the reforms promised a year ago been carried out? Once a Vote was passed either the promises were forgotten or the Chief Secretary found his nominal subordinates were too strong for him and he could not have his own way with them. They might ostensibly yield to throw him off his guard or to escape his strong hand; but that was only to maintain the old rule in the long run and to leave the mechanism running in the old groove. They might stoop; but it always was to conquer. The stock excuses for not carrying out reforms in Ireland were want of time, want of knowledge, and want of power. To expose the dishonesty of the plea of want of time, one had only to remember that it took no more time to do a good thing than to do a bad thing. Want of knowledge on the part of the Minister, not being their fault, could be no valid excuse for making them suffer. Ministers, ex-Ministers, and future Ministers, were overflowing with knowledge and with beneficial projects for Great Britain: but it was only after he had undertaken to govern Ireland that an English statesman began reluctantly to learn the rudiments of the situation there. He began by adopting the version supplied to him by his subordinates, which version he was unable to test. If when the truth began to dawn upon him, in spite of those gentlemen, he attempted to assert himself, they soon made the place too hot for him, and he sought peace at Washington or somewhere else. From their standpoint it was, however, all alien government, and they were under no obligation to discriminate between one Chief Secretary or another, whether he had occupied his position for twenty-four years or only twenty-four hours and whether he represented a Liberal or a Conservative Government.

*The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN pointed out that the hon. Member was not speaking to the Question before the Committee, which was a vote for the expenses of the Irish Local Government Board. The hon. Member seemed to be making general observations as to the administration of Ireland, but he must confine his remarks to the Local Government Board Vote.

Mr. GINNELL said he had been endeavouring to explain the action of the President of the Local Government Board, who was the Chief Secretary, and he thought what he said was relevant to the Vote. He did not think it was irrelevant in this connection to deny that no outsiders, good or bad, had a right to control their affairs. For the reason already stated he would deal with only one detail of the working of the Local Government Board, namely, the failure, at the bidding apparently of his subordinates, of the right hon. Gentleman to allow district councils to avail themselves of the excellent opportunity afforded by the Labourers Act for breaking in upon desert green ranches and sprinkling them with small holdings and with a class of people who were certain to be actually needed as soon as those green ranches could be broken up. This was a class of work which was recognised in England and Scotland to be undoubtedly of a beneficial character, but it was far more urgently needed in certain parts of Ireland where agriculture was the only industry. If the Chief Secretary were strong enough to favour and promote, as the law enabled him to do, the creation of such temporary holdings as were suggested within the limits of the councils' borrowing powers, a means of living in comparative comfort in Ireland would be found for many who must otherwise leave the country. After they had worked and paid for these holdings for some years they could easily be made purchasers of them under the Land Acts, and the district councils would be relieved of so much of the burden. It was not too late even yet to do this. The only outstanding question was one which the Chief Secretary, as President of the Local Government Board, and no one else could answer. That question was whether he would consider this suggestion with an open mind and exercise the power which the law gave him to put it into operation in spite of the antipathy of his subordinates in the Department.

Mr. POWER (Waterford, E.) warmly supported the suggestion of his hon. friend that the right hon. Gentleman should allow the district councils to satisfy the hunger for small holdings. He also urged encouragement of direct labour in road making—the result of which had been that better roads had been produced than under the system of contractors—and the extension of the system of boarding out children. He hoped both these systems would be extended, because, in many cases, the results had been most gratifying. In three cases the children did not know they were Poor Law children; they adopted the names of those who brought them up and became useful members of society. He thought an extension of the system would be most beneficial, because everybody must recognise that the atmosphere of a union was not one in which children should be brought up. While he read with pleasure some of the paragraphs in the Report he considered it on the whole the most dismal document he had ever read. He had always thought that poverty in Ireland was decreasing, but the Report on the contrary showed that poverty and distress were increasing, while the population was decreasing. The statistics showed that the daily average of those in receipt of indoor and outdoor relief, including the people being treated in the hospitals, was 106,051 last year as against 101,251 in the previous year; in other words, one in every forty-one of the population were in receipt of relief. He did not think a more damning condemnation of the government of a country could be found. He hoped a better state of things was in store for Ireland, and when the Treasury and those responsible for the Treasury spoke of the demands that were made upon the Treasury purse, he hoped they would bear these figures in mind, and remember that a great deal of the pauperism complained of was the direct result of the system of government to which Ireland was subjected. He ventured last year to suggest that in the working of the Labourers Act it would be of great advantage if the Local Government Board informed the different unions and district councils of Ireland that they had plans of various types of cottages which were at the disposal of the local authorities. Thousands of cottages had been erected under the Labourers Act. Some were good and some were bad. Every man must be interested in seeing that when money was laid out for such purposes it should be well expended, that the cottages should be good, sightly, and at the same time comfortable for those who had to inhabit them. The Local Government Board had seen cottages erected under their plans, and were in a position now to say which in their opinion was the best plan and what class of house was most suitable. He made the suggestion that the Local Government Board should place themselves in communication with the different councils and unions in Ireland offering them access to these plans, because in his opinion it would be much better for the local authorities to use these plans than to erect unsuitable cottages.

*MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) said he cordially agreed with his hon. friend that the system of boarding out Poor Law children should be widely extended. It was extremely hopeful that the system of boarding out in Ireland was being taken up more and more, because the result had been to merge the Poor Law children in the population of the country, to remove the stigma of pauperism from them, and to allow them to grow up and take their rightful position in the population of the land. There were many points which the Nationalists would like to discuss in reference to the Local Government Board, but naturally under the present circumstances they felt this was hardly the occasion to refer to them. He would, therefore, confine his observations to one point. For several years past the industrial movement in Ireland had been growing in importance, and it was unfortunate that the Local Government Board had exercised its power over the unions and district councils of the country in a manner which, he thought, detrimental to the efforts now being made in Ireland to recover their lost industries and the efforts of the Irish to run the country for themselves. The action of the Local Government Board in surcharging the guardians had been on occasions short-sighted to a degree, and would not be credited in this country. The Local Government Board seemed to a great extent to have made a fetish of the lowest tender and had surcharged boards of guardians because they had accepted tenders of Irish traders for goods of Irish manufacture at a higher price. The fact that a contractor had put in the lowest tender was sufficient for the Board to say the contract must be accepted, and no allowance was made for the reasons put forward by the guardians for accepting higher tenders. He would call attention to a judgment given in the High Courts recently to show how the question of low tender was regarded in this country. It was reported in *The Times* of May 1st. In that case the Highways Committee of the Westminister City Council, who had been surcharged for not having accepted the lowest tender, denied that they had been negligent and pleaded that they had accepted the tender most advantageous to the city The Lord Chief Justice, in his judgment said—

> "The next surcharges were those made against the Members of the Highways Committee, and these rested entirely upon the fact that the Committee had not accepted the lowes tenders. While the duties of an auditor under the Act they were considering were much more important than those of an auditor of a company, he was not entitled to question th judgment of honest men who had come to a *bona fide* decision on these matters. Perhap there was no better illustration of that than in

the acceptance of tenders. Any one with knowledge of these matters knew that the greatest mischief sometimes came about by the acceptance of the lowest tender; and, in his opinion, it would be most dangerous to say that, given honest Members of the committee (against whose character or position in the present instance not a word had been said), simply because they had not accepted the lowest tender that was *prima facie* evidence that they had not discharged their duty. He could well imagine that there might be the acceptance of a higher tender under circumstances that would give rise to suspicion of corruption or want of good faith; but for an auditor to have assumed the responsibility of saying that the tenders in this case ought not to have been accepted, and others ought to have been accepted, because on a hypothetical calculation the council would have saved so much, would be opening the door to a most dangerous practice."

Mr. Justice Darling and Mr. Justice Phillimore also gave judgments in which they concurred in that given by the Lord Chief Justice. He had quoted this to show that the acceptance of a tender which was not the lowest, if it was done for good reason, was borne out by the judgment of the High Court. Now, in Ireland boards of guardians had to deal with tenders from Irish contractors whose prices were a little dearer, but whose tenders were accepted not on grounds of mere sentiment, but because the goods were of better quality, and because the extra service which was got out of them more than made up for the difference in cost. He instanced the question of clothing and of medical supplies. Big English firms tendered at lower prices than the Irish firms. They were able to do so because they were big organisations, and were therefore in a position to cut prices, and compete unfairly with the Irish firms. Though these English firms quoted low figures to begin with, it was perfectly well known that once they established a monopoly prices would go up, and the ratepayers would have to pay higher prices in the future. The Irish firms reduced their tenders, but not to such an extent as the English firms; yet there were advantages to Irish boards in making their contracts with the Irish firms for medical supplies. If there was an outbreak of disease or an epidemic occurred, say in his own county of Kerry, it was convenient that they should be able rapidly to obtain supplies from a medical supply company in Cork, but it would be very inconvenient if the contractor was in Liverpool or in London, or in some other distant part of the United Kingdom. When they came to the question of clothing, economics played an important part. They might have a low tender for an article which was not pure wool; but the board would give the Irish contractor the contract for the reason that his goods were wool throughout. Would it not be ridiculous to interfere with the Board on the ground that the English tenderer's price was lower than that of the Irish contractor, when the real consideration was that the English contractor had tendered for goods which were not all wool, whereas the goods of the Irish contractor were wool throughout and had double and treble the lasting value? He read a short time ago that in 1881 the experiment was tried in North Dublin of getting only Irish clothing. They paid a little more for it, but the result of one or two years experience proved that because of the excellence of the goods they were actually making a saving for the ratepayers. They wanted to be able to give a preference for their own goods, a preference which was demanded by their excellence. It was not a fiscal question, a tariff question, or a free-trade question. They said that though Irish goods were a little bit more expensive yet they were of such excellent quality that a public body was justified in accepting a slightly higher tender from the contractor for Irish goods. The question of industrial revival in Ireland was spreading through all classes, and he was very glad that a number of their public bodies were doing what they could to promote Irish industries. But in any event Irish ratepayers were not fools; they were not going to pay continually for goods which were not of better value than the Irish ones. They were asking for no undue preference in this matter; they merely said that the Lord Chief Justice had decided that when a body honestly accepted a tender which was not the lowest, it was not fair that the auditor should be able to upset contracts simply because a higher tender had been accepted. The importance of this matter was such that a conference of public bodies and boards of guardians had been held, at which they arrived at the conclusion that the best way to further Irish industries was to standardise, as regarded public contracts, the various articles which they required, so that if in all unions they accepted standard articles, Irish manufacturers would be able to manufacture on a larger scale and be able to tender at lower prices than at present. He hoped that in these matters the right hon. Gentleman would see that the Local Government Board did their best to further the industries of the country. That, unfortunately, had not been done in past years, for often the initiative of the Irish people had been crushed, and instead of having been helped their efforts had been stultified. He trusted that the question would receive the consideration of the right hon. Gentleman and of the Department, and that the interests of Irish industries, wherever possible, would be furthered.

MR. BIRRELL said he was much obliged to hon. Gentlemen opposite for their criticisms and the moderation of their remarks. The Local Government Board of Ireland was under the able Vice-Presidency of Sir Henry Robinson, who was one of the most devoted servants that Ireland could hope to have under any form of government. Sir Henry Robinson was a man whose acquaintance he had made only since his short tenure of office, and, if nothing else came of it, he would be glad that he had been brought into contact with so able and devoted a man, whose interest in Ireland had struck him forcibly every time it had been his great advantage to converse with him. He was quite sure that hon. Gentlemen opposite would, if they could enjoy the privilege of knowing and conversing with Sir Henry Robinson, share the opinion which he now unhesitatingly expressed of that distinguished public servant. The Local Government Board of any country had difficult duties to perform, and it could not always be popular if it performed those duties properly. No public department could do its duty properly if it did not aim at the popularity which followed after long years of good work rather than the popularity which was sought after by making easy the path of everybody with whom it was brought into contact. The hon. Member for East Waterford had made a number of interesting observations with which he, as President of the Local Government Board, and the Vice-President entirely sympathised. He had referred to the question of getting the work on the roads done directly rather than indirectly. Experts not only in England, but also in Ireland, entertained the view that it was advantageous to get the work on the roads done directly rather than by contract. Everybody agreed with the observations of the hon. Member for East Waterford in regard to the boarding-out of pauper children. That work could only be done—he was going to say lovingly—with great knowledge of the character of the people to whom the children were sent, and by personally calling upon the children in their cottage homes. He knew of no country where this system of boarding-out was likely to be more successful than among the kindly population of Ireland. The guardians were the authority for this work; but the Local Government Board would do all they could to encourage efforts in this direction. The figures which had been quoted relating to poverty and pauperism in Ireland were of a lamentable and melancholy character, though he thought they were not worse than the figures for England. The Irish Government would do all they could to prevent any increase in pauperism, but the Local Government Board could not be made responsible for the increase in outdoor relief. He thought it was desirable that the Local Government Board should supply to the district councils model plans for the erection of model cottages, which had been proved to be efficient, economical, and convenient in other parts of the country. He would undertake to look into the matter to see exactly how things stood. If he might allude to his personal intercourse with Sir Henry Robinson, that was a point upon which the Vice-President held strong views, and they were quite in accord with the views expressed by the hon. Member. The hon. Member for South

Kerry had made an interesting speech upon an important subject, namely, the question of always being bound to accept the lowest tender. He quite agreed with the judgment of the Lord Chief Justice of England as to the folly of laying it down as an absolute rule in all circumstances that fiduciary bodies should be bound to accept the lowest tender irrespective of their own opinion of the articles supplied. The cheapest articles were not always the best. They should aim at getting the most suitable article at the cheapest price. In such a matter as clothing, no doubt, the solution was for public bodies to determine by sample the sort of thing wanted, and make it known, and when those interested in Irish industries were able to produce that kind of article he was sure they would have the preference. Medical supplies were somewhat different, because half the cost of drugs supplied to workhouses was paid for out of Imperial funds, and there was not quite the same check on the guardians. In that matter, therefore, it was desirable to take a somewhat strict view. It had sometimes been brought to their notice that some boards of guardians preferred to buy their drugs from Irish firms; but it seemed to be overlooked that many of those drugs were not of Irish manufacture, and really the Irish firms were only middlemen, and in no sense of the word could they be said to be supplying Irish goods. He did not think, however, that it would be advisable to relax their hold upon boards of guardians. He was not casting any imputation upon Irish boards of guardians, who did their work as well as the English boards of guardians, but they did require looking after, because irregularities had been proved against them—not acts of dishonesty, but acts of favouritism, which cast a burden on the ratepayers which ought not to have been so cast. Whoever controlled the Local Government Board would be playing a very unpatriotic part if they did not maintain a very high standard and keep a sharp control over boards of guardians. He did not think that the Local Government Board had in any particular instance exercised their control partially or unwisely.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.) said the question of tenders was a very acute one in Ireland, though he did not suggest that there had been any general dereliction of duty in the matter by Irish public bodies. Frequently the Local Government Board had had to remind public bodies in Ireland as to what their duty was in regard to tenders. With regard to the Sligo County Council, it would be remembered that the Government had to adopt some very drastic measures in regard to the action of that body in accepting a tender which was at least 50 per cent. higher than the lowest tender, and the Local Government Board had been blamed for declaring that contract null and void. Speaking broadly, he thought public bodies in Ireland had safeguarded the public interest as regarded their acceptance of public tenders. He agreed with what had fallen from the Chief Secretary in regard to contracts for medicines, because there were no more important contracts entered into by boards of guardians. It was extremely important in that matter that tenders should be accepted only from really responsible persons. He knew what he was speaking of when he stated that there were at least three or four firms of the very first standing in Ireland who were fit to compete with any firms in the wholesale drug line either in Liverpool or London. He thought the practice of boards of guardians in this matter should be to accept the lowest tender, because there was always this safeguard, that the medical officer was responsible for seeing that the guardians got what they were paying for. Considering that the Chancellor of the Exchequer reimbursed the boards of guardians he thought the Chief Secretary had taken a proper attitude in this important matter. He was surprised to find from the accounts of the Local Government Board that this Government, which came into office on a cry of retrenchment, and on the principle of economy, should have presented a Budget promising a large increase of £12,845 in connection with this important department. He cordially joined in the tribute paid by the Chief Secretary to the head of the department. He had a splendid record of public service. In the item for salaries and wages there was an increase of £5,814. There was an allowance of £252 to an auditor while one of the Commissioners was performing other duties. Referring to the transfer from this important department to another public department of one of its chief officials, he presumed that the Government were strictly within their right, but he thought he would have the sympathy of the Committee when he said it was not in the public interest that a permanent official, who had been for any considerable period of years in a particular department, should be transferred to another department. The principle was an unsound one, and should not be lightly resorted to. The cost of the transfer in this case was £252, and he submitted that the Government would have had no difficulty in getting another gentleman equally or probably better qualified as regarded this particular department, to undertake the work without the prospect of any reward. The Estimate also included £3,000 for temporary inspectors, as against £1,020 in the previous year. That was a phenomenal increase, and he awaited with interest any possible explanation which might be given. He asked also for an explanation of the increase with respect to the clerical staff. There was an item in the Estimates for temporary lady inspectors. He suggested that there should be nothing temporary about the employment of lady inspectors who were fulfilling important and valuable work. He had the utmost pleasure in saying, from personal knowledge, that there was no more valuable work done in Ireland than that performed by the lady inspectors in looking after boarded-out children. As to the cost of the audit of public accounts, he was sure that hon. Members were aware, from the protests which had been addressed to them, that charges made upon public bodies for auditing their accounts were a cause of much complaint. He had the utmost sympathy with the protests, and yet he felt that a full and efficient audit was an absolute necessity to public bodies in Ireland. No public body had a right to object to it, but he thought it reasonable to suggest that the large annual increase in the cost of the audit was a matter that required close investigation by the Chief Secretary. Last year the Public Audit Department cost the country £13,825, while the receipts amounted to only £6,500. He asked for further information with regard to that £6,500. He submitted that the organisation of the Department called for close supervision, believing that the total cost involved was entirely out of proportion to the work done and the return obtained for it. He knew that considerable extra cost had been thrown on the department through the inquiries necessary under the Labourers Acts. To that additional cost he offered no objection, because he believed the work was necessary and would be increasingly valuable. There was on the Estimates this year a salary of £800 per annum for an additional assistant secretary. What was the meaning of that appointment? While he valued the work of this important department, and had no desire to offer carping criticism, he thought the Committee was entitled to explanations from the Government of the increases to which he had called attention.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. CHERRY, Liverpool, Exchange) said the hon. Member for West Meath seemed to be under some misapprehension as to the powers of the Local Government Board under the Labourers Act of last session. The Act gave no increased powers to the Board to acquire unoccupied land for the purposes of the labourer or any other person. He understood the hon. Gentleman to say that it did. He thought the charge which the hon. Gentleman made had reference to the action of the Board in not seeking to get unoccupied land placed at the disposal of the labourers.

MR. GINNELL: In not allowing the district councils to do it.

MR. CHERRY said the hon. Member did not mention any specific case. While the Board had no power to acquire unoccupied land, they might refuse under the Act to assent to a scheme brought forward for the purpose of providing labourers cottages or allotments for labourers where cottages had already been built. When schemes were brought before the Board their inspectors reported upon them. After considering these reports the Board sanctioned or refused the schemes, and in respect of any decision come to an appeal lay to the County Court Judge. There was no allegation, so far as he was aware, that the Board had interfered unjustifiably in the way of objecting to a scheme being carried out. Might he remind the Committee what the powers conferred by the Act of 1906 were? One section enabled the Estates Commissioners to sell, for the purposes of labourers, parcels of unoccupied land which they had acquired under the Act of 1903. Another section enabled the Estates Commissioners, when disposing of unoccupied land, to sell to district councils for the purpose of carrying out schemes sanctioned under the Labourers Act. In other words, they had a voluntary transfer of land instead of compulsory purchase, thus effecting a saving of expense and trouble. These were, so far as he was aware, the only two conditions of the Act which affected the question. The Estates Commissioners were given further powers last year in respect to unoccupied lands to be transferred to district councils, and the Commissioners would, no doubt, turn their attention to this matter when the more pressing claims of the evicted tenants were disposed of. He was quite sure that in a very short time the whole of the evicted tenants would be dealt with by the Estates Commissioners. As to the increases in the Local Government Board Vote referred to by the hon. Member for Londonderry, N., the whole staff of the Board had had to be increased in consequence of the increase of work imposed upon it by Parliament. Under the Labourers Act of last year, no less than 41,000 cottages had been applied for. Every Act passed for Ireland meant additional expense for administration and clerical work in the different Departments. There was, for instance, £3,000 in this Vote for temporary inspectors who were engaged at the present moment in conducting inquiries all over the country. Then there was a considerable increase in the correspondence with the different county councils, which entailed increased expenditure. The need was not a temporary but a permanent one, and it would not be advisable that some officers in the Department should hold permanent appointments and others only temporary appointments.

MR. MOORE said that those who were interested in the labourers question had watched very closely the first year's Estimates after the passing of the Labourers Act. They had been assured, in the first place, that the result of that Act would be a great cheapening of procedure; but when they came to look at the Estimates they found that every penny of the charges had to be met by the local authorities. This year the expenses had risen from £2,000 to £6,000, and the cost of the arbitration proceedings from £2,500 to £7,000. A very significant note appeared at the foot of the page in the Estimates referring to the Labourers Acts, which stated that the Appropriation-in-Aid had been paid by the local bodies. It was very easy for the Government to put down an increase of expenditure in this large-hearted way, but the ratepayers had to make it good.

It was particularly unfortunate that the Government should have chosen this year to increase the expenditure threefold, because in the same year they had reduced the Grants-in-Aid to local bodies in the north of Ireland. In the county of Antrim the grant had been reduced by £2,400, although in North Antrim they had built ten new cottages. This question affected not only the ratepayers, but the labourers, who were least able to protect themselves; because, when the local bodies found that the rates were going up from 6d. to 8d. in the £, to supply labourers cottages, it made the local bodies unwilling to supply the accommodation wanted.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Would the hon. Member say what he had done for his labourers?

MR. MOORE said he did not want to boast of what he had done; but when he had been asked by the local authority what he would do, he wrote at once to say that he would give four acres of land for labourers cottages. He was therefore not at all ashamed of his record as to what he had done for the labourers on his estate.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) maintained that the picture given of the results of the Act of last year by the hon. Member was a dishonest one. It had been said that the estimate for inquires was increased. Why? Because more cottages were about to be built in the next two or three years than were built in the previous quarter of a century. A more preposterous and unfounded speech was never delivered than that of the hon. Gentleman. It might be true that more cottages had been built in North Antrim than in Mayo, because in North Antrim there were large numbers of labourers, and in East Mayo there were hardly any. He supported the Bill because he thought the money ought to be spent where the labourers cottages were needed, and therefore his withers were unwrung. The hon. Gentleman ought to be ashamed to speak on this subject at all. If he had any sense of decency——

MR. MOORE: Is that expression not disorderly?

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: I see nothing disorderly in it. It is a matter of opinion.

MR. MOORE: I beg to say, Mr. Chairman, that I am utterly indifferent to the hon. Member's opinion.

MR. DILLON said he was entitled to his opinion. The conduct of the counties in the provinces of Leinster and Munster was most creditable. In most of the counties of Ulster they had been most selfish, and if they had lost money under the Act of last year they had only done so in proportion to the extent which they had shirked their duty to the labourers.

MR. CHARLES CRAIG (Antrim, S.) said that Members for the North of Ireland had always admitted that the Labourers Acts were not well administered there, but that was the fault of the local authorities. The labourers in the North of Ireland required cottages, however, just as much as the labourers in county Cork. The hon. Member for East Mayo helped them by stealing the money which would have helped to build these houses, and taking it to the south of Ireland. It was true that money had been accumulated which ought to have been spent long ago, and that money would have been spent had it not been for the act of robbery to which hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite lent themselves last session and which deprived the labourers of the north of Ireland of hundreds of cottages. No doubt hon. Members from Ireland sitting below the gangway thought it good business to take £10,000 from the labourers of the north of Ireland to their own part of the country, yet the hon. Member for East Mayo found fault with the natural indignation which his hon. friend exhibited when the recollection of what happened last session in regard to this matter was brought home to him. He agreed to the full with his two hon. friends below him, and he agreed with the hon. Member for North Derry that the creation of a new Secretary with a salary of £800 a year, together with the other charges to which their attention had been drawn, was not likely to help the cause of the labourers in the north of Ireland. They first of all robbed them of £10,000 a year, and then asked them to pay what appeared upon the face of it to be an unusually large charge. He hoped the Chief Secretary would give some explanation with regard to this.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL (Dublin University) thought it would be desirable before the discussion closed that there should be some further explanation of the enormous increase in the Estimate for the ensuing year. The Attorney-General might be right in saying that to some extent it was due to the additional number of applications that were pending by reason of the Act of last session. At the same time it was impossible that that could account for the enormous increase of £12,000, and it was equally impossible that it could explain the necessity of a new permanent official at a salary of £800 a year. The great increase in the number of applications could not go on. There was last year a very large increase owing to the increased facility, but that increase would every year get proportionately less, and the duties of the Local Government Board in connection with the Labourers Act would also decrease. Under the Act of last session the increased expenses incidental to the larger demand anticipated was supposed to be financed by an Act of the same session by £9,000; the Government introduced a Bill for the purpose of cutting down the number of Judges by two and of reducing the Lord Chancellor's salary from £8,000 to £2,000, but they never made the slightest effort to pass it. They deliberately allowed it to remain even to the end of the session, and they did it without the slightest complaint or remonstrance from hon. Members for Ireland below the Gangway.

*THE DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN: Order, order. You cannot discuss this on the question of the Vote. The Local Government Board is not responsible for the failure to pass legislation.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL thought the Deputy-Chairman had not quite appreciated his point. He was calling attention to the large increase in the Estimate in connection with the administration of the Labourers Act for the ensuing year, and he was pointing out that the fund contemplated by the Bill of last year to finance the Act had not been provided. With the greatest confidence he submitted that that was perfectly in order in connection with the subject they were now discussing.

MR. DILLON, on the point of order, said that even if it were in order to discuss this matter from the point of view put forward by the right hon. Gentleman, he would call attention to the fact that that Act abolishing the Judges had nothing whatever to do with the increased expenditure thrown upon the Votes.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said that did not at all get rid of the point that while there was not merely an increased Estimate of over £12,000, but there had also been no provision made such as was contemplated, namely, an annual sum of £9,000, to finance last year's Act.

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is a Local Government Vote.

MR. JAMES CAMPBELL said that it was the Local Government Board which had to administer the Labourers Act, and it was their administration and financial management that had been the subject of the debate. He had listened with the greatest pleasure to the by no means exaggerated terms in which the right hon. Gentleman had referred to the Vice-President of the Local Government Board. He had been officially connected with him for a few years, and very frequently came in contact with him. His experience of Sir Henry Robinson coincided with that of the right hon. Gentleman, that in the Vice-President they had an officer whose whole desire was to discharge his duties efficiently, and with due regard to every interest concerned in Ireland. On the question of the lowest tender, he agreed with the hon. Member for South Kerry, that to lay down an inflexible rule that in every case the lowest tender must necessarily be accepted by boards of guardians, or by any other public bodies, would be a very great mistake; but he could not conceive it possible that the occasion would ever arise, because if boards of guardians were compelled to accept in every case the lowest tender they would be obliged to accept the shoddy goods of an English firm, while they could have got for a slight additional sum pure woollen goods from an Irish firm. But the answer to that was obvious. No sensible board of guardians would ever accept a tender for shoddy goods; they would require a sample, and would contract for delivery according to the approved sample. He had been pleased to hear, however, the strongly expressed views of the hon. Member for South Kerry in favour of protecting Irish industries. By accepting the higher tender they could encourage Irish industries against English manufactured goods, rather than accept the English tender at the lower price. That was, he thought, the elementary lesson of protection, and he was glad that the idea at least on the benches below the Gangway, among hon. Members from Ireland, was making some headway. He could only say that he thoroughly endorsed what had been said by the right hon. Gentleman in regard to the question of the lowest tender. He quite agreed that no such inflexible rule should be, or ever had been, adopted by the Local Government Board. But speaking generally, everything else being equal, he thought the lowest tender should be accepted, and the possible danger of getting inferior goods could be obviated by deciding on a sample, and requiring a delivery up to the standard and quality of that sample. Subject to that limitation he quite agreed that the Local Government Board could not lay down the inflexible rule that in every case the lowest tender must be accepted.

MR. BIRRELL said he had listened with great pleasure to the very high character which had been given of the Vice-President of the Local Government Board by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The increased Estimate for the Local Government Board was due partly to the natural increment of great offices of this kind, owing to the desire of officials for higher salaries, but was mainly accounted for by the extra work thrown upon the Board by the new Labourers Act. The number of applications for cottages and sites now amounted to 46,000, and it was felt that things would get into a hopeless muddle unless a separate department with an assistant secretary was organised. These applications caused an enormous increase of work; there were inquiries to be made, sites to be selected, arbitrations, and all the rest of it, and it was found that a separate department to deal with the work was absolutely necessary if hopeless confusion was to be avoided. These cottages were to be built all over Ireland and the money had got to be repaid; so that there would be work for many a long year, in connection with these Acts, for the Local Government Board to do. He, therefore, thought that there was nothing at all improvident in this matter. In regard to the point raised by the hon. Member for Derry as to a public audit, it was a matter which he would look into and ascertain what the explanation of it was. Sir Henry Robinson was to have been present that night, but he was too unwell to leave Ireland. He would look into the matter and see whether any reduction could be effected in what certainly appeared to be a large figure. He did not want to go into the controversy about the cottages in the north of Ireland. They had been told by the hon. Gentleman opposite that his predecessor was a sort of highway robber, who in combination with other persons of the same kidney, inflicted a cruel blow upon several counties in Ireland. He must tell hon. Gentlemen that the object of Section 18 was to secure an equitable distribution. The following example would show the inequity of the former method of distribution—county Antrim, share for the year 1905–6, £2,453, and number of cottages erected since 1891, 212; county Cork, £3,466 and 2,030 respectively; Tyrone, £1,926 and 184; Limerick, £1,553 and 2,647; Down £2,010 and 235. As to the distribution of the Exchequer grants, he pointed out that the money had to be allocated among the various counties, according to their liabilities under the Labourers Acts. If that were robbery, it was one of which he should be very proud.

MR. T. L. CORBETT said he would like to see more equity in dealing with the north of Ireland. His hon. friend would have exhausted the strongest Parliamentary language permissible if he had expressed half of what the hon. Members representing Ulster thought of this deliberate spoliation and robbery, by which money had been filched away from the labourers in the north simply because they were Unionists.

MR. BIRRELL: Is it in order for the hon. Member to impute motives?

MR. T. L. CORBETT said that it was no doubt only in order to impute motives when one happened to be outside the House. [Cries of "Withdraw."]

*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Surely the hon. Member knows that it is worse to impute motives inside the House?

MR. T. L. CORBETT said he knew it was safer to impute them outside, but if requested to withdraw the expression, he would do so at once. The hon. Member for East Mayo had made a more violent and vitriolic speech than usual. He had said that the counties in the North of Ireland were being justly punished by having this amount of money taken away from them for the building of cottages, because he thought those cottages should be erected in the south and west of Ireland, where political opinions were more in accord with his own.

MR. DILLON said that no money was taken away. The distribution had been altered because certain places in the North of Ireland had refused to spend the money on cottages.

MR. T. L. CORBETT said the Ulster Members had never defended the action of certain local authorities in refusing to build cottages, but had brought pressure on them to spend the money at their disposal. The Government had deliberately said that, because local authorities had not spent the money at their disposal in the North of Ireland in every case, they would punish the labourers for the fault of those local authorities. ["No," and "Hear, hear."] The money would have been spent if the Government had chosen to put pressure on the local authorities, instead of robbing them as they were doing now, simply because they were Unionist, and devoting the money to their new allies below the gangway. He joined with the representatives of Ulster in making a most earnest protest against what they believed to be a deliberate injustice to the part of the country they represented and one which, he feared, was dictated by purely political motives.

SIR HENRY CRAIK (Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities) said there were certain aspects of this Vote which required more attention. He had had a long experience in drawing up Estimates, and he knew how difficult it was to get them passed by the Treasury and through the House. He was bound to say that he had never before, in any Estimate, seen an increase so little justified by any arguments from the front bench opposite. He understood that the money administered under the Labourers Act amounted to about £60,000 a year. If hon. Members would look at the heads A and F for 1907-8, and compare them with 1906-7, they would find that there was an increase of nearly £15,000. That was a very large amount. The increase of expenses on the sum administered had been 25 per cent. Such an increase, so little justified, he had never known. Five or six per cent. of the total cost for expenses of administration was amply sufficient. He could only protest that these Estimates showed that the administrative charges were largely in excess of the proportion they ought to bear to the amounts administered. Some check should be put upon the extravagance in administration. The Departments in Ireland seemed to administer on principles totally different from those applied in Scotland or England. When he was in the Scottish Education Department any increase in administrative cost, however small, was most jealously judged, and rightly so. The Committee should take into consideration the lax manner in which matters regarding Irish salaries were administered.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.) expressed satisfaction at the appointment of additional inspectors to carry out the administrative work of the Labourers Act. It was chiefly in connection with that Act that the additional expense had been incurred. The district councils and the labourers desired that the Act should be administered efficiently. The ratepayers in the county of Limerick taxed themselves up to 1s. in the pound, and they thought it was only fair that they should get a larger share of the Exchequer contribution. When the Bill was going through the House last year he asked the Chief Secretary to give the district council who taxed themselves so heavily an additional grant, but his request was not acceded to. The hon. Members from the North of Ireland who had spoken on this subject had no reason to complain of the way in which the Exchequer contribution had been dealt with.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

SUPPLY [25TH APRIL].

Resolutions reported.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1907-8.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £2,758,400 be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Works, Buildings, and Repairs, at Home and Abroad, including the cost of Superintendence, Purchase of Sites, Grants in Aid, and other charges connnected therewith, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1908."

2. "That a sum not exceeding £837,900 be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Half Pay, Reserved, and Retired Pay, to Officers of the Navy and Marines, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1908."

3. "That a sum, not exceeding £370,900, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of Civil Pensions and Gratuities, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1908."

Resolutions agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Whiteley*),—put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at four minutes before Eleven o'clock.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, *3rd May*, 1907.

The House met at Twelve of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

Brighouse Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill; Shanklin Gas Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

Brecon and Merthyr Tydfil Junction Railway Bill. As amended, considered o be read the third time.

Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill. As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Chester, Chorley, Fenton, Hanwell, Rochford (Rural), Scunthorpe, and the Thornton Joint Hospital District," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed [Bill 175.]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill. "To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Dunstable and the counties of West Suffolk and East Sussex and West Sussex," presented by Dr. Macnamara; supported by Mr. Burns; read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 176.]

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petition from Leicester, against; to lie upon the Table.

HOME WORK REGULATION BILL.

Petition of the Royal Sanitary Institute, against; to lie upon the Table.

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.

Petition from Huddersfield, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Dalny; Edinburgh (two); and Glasgow; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petitions against; from Guthlaxton; and Shrewsbury; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petition from Guisborough, for legislation; to lie upon the Table.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petition of the Scottish Branch of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

WHITE SLAVE TRAFFIC (INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE) (MISCELLANEOUS, No. 2, 1907).

Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the International Conference on the White Slave Traffic, held in Paris, October, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

HARBOUR, ETC., BILLS (BURNHAM (SOMERSET) PIER BILL).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 2nd May; *Mr. Lloyd-George*]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 137.]

ARKLOW HARBOUR.

Copy presented, of Report of the Arklow Harbour Commissioners and Statement of Accounts for 1906 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Irish Resident Magistrates—Names, Ages, Religions, and Salaries.

MR. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the names, ages, religions, and salaries of the resident magistrates at present serving in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The names, ages, and salaries of resident magistrates at present serving in Ireland are as follows:—

Name.	Age on 1st March, 1907.	Salary.
		£
Bell, A.	49	550
Bourke, U.	61	675
Brady, A. N.	57	675
Brown, R. L.	55	550
Bull, R. G.	58	550
Butler, G. B.	50	550
Byrne, J. P.	47	425
Callan, W. E.	32	425
Crane, Captain C. P.	49	550
Creaghe, P. C.	56	550
Crosbie, Captain C. H	40	425
Crotty, R. D.	64	675
Dease, Major E. J.	46	550
Dickson, J. M.	46	550
Dunsterville, J. W. E.	56	550
Edgeworth-Johnstone, Captain W.	43	425
Fitzgerald, V. S. Vesey-	58	675
FitzPatrick, F.	50	425
Flanagan, J. G. Woulfe	43	550
French, J.	53	550
Gardiner, J. C.	62	675
Gibson, T. D.	62	675
Gosselin, Captain B.	36	425
Gray, J.	48	425
		£
Griffin, G.	52	550
Hardy, J. A.	44	550
Harper, A. M.	56	675
Harrel, A. G. W.	41	425
Henn, F. B.	59	675
Hickson, E. F.	59	550
Hodder, F. G.	60	550
Holmes, W.	35	425
Horne, A. E.	63	675
Hornibrook, M.	33	425
Jephson, C. D. H. J.	50	550
Jones, W.	59	550
Kelly, P. J.	52	550
Kilbride, J.	42	550
Kilkelly, J. M.	63	675
Lloyd, E. T.	46	550
MacDermot, E. J.	60	550
M'Lean, J.	60	550
Meldon, A. G.	61	675
Mercer, G. D.	64	675
Moore, W. M. S.	36	425
Nagle, G.	54	675
Newell, A. C.	60	550
O'Hara, W. J.	49	425
Olphert, R. F.	56	550
Orr, W.	48	550
Paul, Sir W. J., Bart.	55	675

Name.	Age on March, 1907.	Salary.
		£
Pery, Captain Hon. H. de Vere - - -	55	675
Preston, J. - - -	56	550
Purdon, B. R. - -	56	550
Rice, W. H. - - -	54	425
Shannon, G. H. - -	51	675
Sullivan, P. D. - -	44	550
Sullivan, W. - - -	47	550
Smith, W. F. H. - -	63	675
Starkie, R. F. - -	51	550
Thackeray, Major M. -	52	550
Townsend, N. L. - -	60	675
Turner, H. - - -	57	675
Tynte, Lieutenant-Colonel M. - -	60	550
Welch, Captain F. - -	61	675
White, J. T. - - -	38	425
Wynne, E. M. P. - -	47	425

Fifty of the above gentlemen are Protestants and seventeen are Catholics. In addition to salary, each resident magistrate receives a fixed allowance of £100 a year to meet the expense of travelling on duty within a radius of fifteen miles from his headquarters, and one of £8 a year for postage, stationery, etc.

Religious Views of Irish Officials.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total number of judges of the High Court, County Court judges, recorders, lords-lieutenant of counties, deputy lieutenants, justices of the peace, Crown solicitors, and clerks of the peace in Ireland; and how many, under each head, share the religious views of the majority of the people of Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The total number of each of the above classes is as follows: Judges of the High Court, 17; County Court judges (including five recorders), 21; lieutenants of counties and of cities, 34; deputy lieutenants, 666; justices of the peace, (*a*) holding ordinary commission of the peace, 5,518, (*b*) ex-officio justices as chairmen of county or district councils or of town commissioners, 200, total 5,718; Crown solicitors (including 10 sessional Crown solicitors), 41; clerks of the Crown and peace (including three clerkships of the peace that have not yet been united to the clerkships of the Crown), 36. Of the 5,518 persons holding the ordinary commission of the peace, 1,805 are believed to be Catholics and of the remainder there are 75 whose religious persuasion has not yet been ascertained. The religious persuasion of the 200 ex-officio justices is unknown. There is no official record of the religious persuasion of the members of the several other classes abovementioned.

Roman Catholics in Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the total number of county inspectors, district inspectors, and head constables now serving in the Royal Irish Constabulary, and how many under each head are Catholics.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) On 1st January, 1907, the latest date for which statistics are available, the number of county inspectors serving in the Royal Irish Constabulary was thirty-seven, of whom five were Catholics; the number of district inspectors was 202, of whom 62 were Catholics; and the number of head constables 225, of whom 156 were Catholics.

Houses in Ireland Valued at £2 or Less.

MR. J. MACVEAGH: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of houses in each province of Ireland valued at £2 or less.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I have not this information, and to procure it would involve a far greater expenditure of time, labour, and money than I feel justified in authorising.

Administration of Irish Affairs.

MR. HIGHAM (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland what are the names of the various Boards under which Irish affairs are now administered; and will he give in each case the date of their institution.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) I am considering the question of laying upon the Table, in connection with the proposed legislation for Ireland, a Return as to the Irish Government Departments. I would ask my hon. friend to await that Return.

COMPULSORY WEIGHING AND MEASUREMENTS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. GEORGE ROBERTS (Norwich) said the Bill the Second Reading of which he moved was a measure of considerable importance to a large number of workers throughout the country, particularly in regard to those engaged in piecework. The title of the Bill showed that it had particular reference to workers in the iron and steel industry. His hon. friend the Member for Gorton represented that particular section of workers, and therefore he would not occupy any time in dilating upon that topic, but would leave the subject to his hon. friend who, from his practical knowledge, would be able to state the case much better than he could possibly do. It was well known that a large number of those workers had a great grievance, and it very often happened that they suffered reductions from their wages through the lack of any measure providing for compulsory weighing in that particular industry. In all those questions in which wages were primarily concerned, he submitted that when workmen had entered into an honourable agreement to perform work at a stated sum they should be assured of receiving the amount they earned by their labour. He intended devoting his remarks to the case of a considerable number of workers who were not directly represented in the House. The title of the Bill covered workers in various cement factories in the country. Perhaps he might explain that cement was composed of a mixture of chalk and clay in certain proportions, added to which in the process of burning were coal and coke. The chalk and clay were weighed for the purpose of getting the necessary proportions, but, although this was done, under existing conditions the men had no means of knowing the weights with which they had to deal. After weighing, this mixture was put through the wash mill and reappeared in the form of slurry. It then passed on to the drying floors. The next process was that of breaking it up and putting it into kilns together with the coal and coke, and this produced what was called clinker. The compound was then drawn out and ground up and became the finished product. In all those processes the men were paid by weight—that was, by tonnage. The men who had to dig the chalk were sometimes paid by measurements at so much per yard, but in neither of those processes had the men any means of checking the weight of the product of their labour, and consequently they had to rely upon the disposition of the firms by whom they were employed to know how much work they had performed, and what wages they were entitled to. It sometimes happened that the chalk dug by the men was not only used directly by the cement works to which the chalk works or quarries were attached, but was very often transmitted to other firms in different parts of the country. It would be readily seen that a situation of this character often caused disputes between firms and the men they employed, and all they were asking for in this Bill was an extension of the principle of the check weighman clauses of the Coal Mines Regulation Act. Therefore they had a good precedent to work upon and something which he thought would commend itself to the favourable consideration of the House. In the case of the cement workers many hard cases had been brought to his notice where men had been defrauded of wages to which they were justly entitled. He did not intend to weary the House by quoting all those cases, but in order to prove that these men had a substantial grievance he would mention one or two. In one case the difference worked out at forty tons per week. In other words, £3 or £4 per week was deducted from the wages that the men had really earned, owing to the inability of the men accurately to get from the firm the weights they had dealt with. There was also a great difficulty in getting the men to swear to such cases for fear they might be discharged. In one case an action was taken, but it had to be dropped mainly owing to the fear of the men to appear in Court to substantiate their grievance. One glaring case had been brought to his notice in which it was proved that the manager had placed pieces of lead on the scale, which made a difference of 6d. on every barrel of clinker weighed. Information was given to the Inspector of Weights and Measures, and he went down to the works, took possession of the pieces of lead, but legal proceedings were not taken because of the difficulty of getting the men to appear in Court for fear they might be discharged from their situations. A difference of forty tons, worked out at the rate of 1s. 10d. per ton, came to £3 13s. 4d., or an average of 2s. per man employed. A sum of 2s. deducted from the wages of this class of labourer was often a very serious matter, and all those who were directly connected with the working classes knew that it frequently meant the difference between making both ends meet and being landed in a serious struggle against poverty. In another case it was pointed out that the firm alleged that the men had been paid for more tons than they had produced. Again the men had no check against the firm's statement, and a certain amount was deducted from their wages week by week until the men had refunded the extra sum that the firm alleged they had received. It was most unsatisfactory that a firm should have the power to make a statement of that sort and the men should be unable to check the weights in a matter satisfactory and convincing to themselves. He would now deal with the class of men known as dock labourers. If his information served him correctly, he believed that the Government were not unwilling to appoint a Departmental Committee to consider this question, and he believed that the promoters of the Bill were quite agreeable to that course being adopted. He hoped that if such a Committee was called into existence it would be composed of an equal number of employers and workmen's representatives, so that their findings might be of a satisfactory and impartial character. He hoped that any Bill subsequently framed would be wide in its scope so as to include all sections of workers who were paid by weight or measure. With regard to dock labourers, they had no method of knowing by the production of the bill of lading or the invoice how much material they had handled. They could not demand to see the way bills or bills of lading certifying the amount of tonnage worked, and consequently they had to accept the statement of the foreman or the employer as the case might be. He knew of one organisation of labourers who had repeatedly to pay a fee of 5s. at the Customs House for the purpose of securing a copy of a way bill. He thought it would be agreed that a procedure of that sort should be unnecessary, and that the men ought to have an easy method of knowing how much material they had handled. It would be seen that when these men handled pig iron, railway iron, ballast, coal, salt, and all cargoes where piece prices prevailed, the men might suffer deduction in an unwarrantable fashion. In the case of dock labourers, he knew that interminable disputes had been produced under this particular head. With regard to this class of labour he had one or two very glaring cases brought under his notice. In Aberdeen about four years ago some men complained that they had been deprived of considerable weights in the case of nearly every steamer they discharged. Subsequently upon inquiries being made it was found that the son, who was the manager, and a foreman were in collusion, and when action was taken the case assumed such a serious aspect that the son was bailed out at the very high surety of £600 and the foreman at £250. Unfortunately both of them were able to take flight and got across the Atlantic before the action was tried. In another case the men alleged that they had been deprived of forty tons weight. This, worked out at 9½d. per ton, represented £1 11s. 8d. for one boat. When it was pointed out that many boats were discharged by these men each week it would be seen that they had a very substantial grievance, and that the provisions of this Bill were necessary in order to protect their labour. The provisions of the Bill brought no new or novel principle into the legislation of the country, and were simply an extension of a principle already legally enacted which he thought would be readily admitted to have worked very satisfactorily in the coal mines of the country. He felt that the enactment of this measure in the wide sense he had indicated would tend to allay friction, prevent disputes, and establish harmonious relationship between employers and employed. It was sometimes alleged that Parliament ought not to be troubled with these matters, and that they were best settled by trade unions. Trade unions had been attempting to adjust these matters for a great many years past, but, after all, it would be admitted that trade union action very often involved a large number of men in small disputes. They were anxious as far as possible to make the occasion for strikes as rare as possible. Strikes might occasionally be necessary, but they represented a somewhat antiquated method of conducting industrial disputes. The heaviest responsibilities of strikes fell not alone upon the workmen, but rather upon the women and children behind them, who had to suffer out of all proportion to the needs of the case. He submitted that it was much wiser and better that they should come to the House of Commons indicating lines along which peaceful methods might be established, and he felt sure that all portions of the House would recognise that they were simply desirous of securing justice for the men in ways that would be in no way inimical to the best interests of the employer. After all, the fair and honest employer had nothing whatever to fear from the enactment of such a measure as this. On the other hand, it was in the best interests of the fair employer that all who were not quite so willing to deal justly with their workmen should be brought into line; otherwise competition would be accentuated and the fair employer would suffer because of the unfair methods of his competitors. He submitted that on the Second Reading of the Bill it was unnecessary for him to speak at any greater length, because its provisions were not new to an Act of Parliament, and Members were pretty well able to gauge what the promoters were aiming at and what were the possibilities of the measure. He trusted that the Bill would receive due consideration at the hands of the House, and if the Government were not opposed to the appointment of a Departmental Committee, he hoped that Committee would be composed in such a way as to inspire confidence in all classes of workmen concerned, and that as a result the Government would frame a measure which would establish justice for the men, and at the same time not be inimical to the best interests of the employers or the trade of the country as a whole.

Mr. George Roberts.

*MR. HODGE (Lancashire, Gorton), in seconding, said that a few weeks ago the Home Secretary was good enough to receive a deputation of those interested in this particular measure, and on that occasion he promised them a Departmental inquiry. At the same time he thought it was wise that the principle of the measure should be established by a vote of the House. As was stated when they met the Home Secretary, they had nothing to fear from inquiry, but everything to gain. He thought it would be an easy matter to establish the fact that this particular proposal was absolutely essential, not only in the interests of the workmen concerned, but in the interests of fair competition with honest employers. In an article in a trade journal devoted to the employers' interests it was stated that the existing methods had been found satisfactory. That statement was made in view of the introduction of this measure. He had sent out a circular of inquiry to seventy steel works, with respect to the question of compulsory weighing. He discovered that there were only three at which every ingot was weighed. In eighteen works the employers gave facilities occasionally for weighing material the men produced, and the workers were paid on the average of the results ascertained. At forty-nine of these works the men complained most strongly of unfair treatment in the matter of weighing. He would mention a case in point. He had a letter from a works in Scotland where the men were so dissatisfied with the amount that was being paid to them that they demanded a test weighing. When the test took place they discovered that the average weight of the ingots was 4 tons 12 cwts. Later on when they asked the stocktaker as to the amount allowed they found that they had only been allowed 4 tons 6 cwts. Naturally the men complained strongly of being robbed of their wages in that fashion. No other word could properly designate that act on the part of the employer. It was simply robbing the men of what they had earned. The promoters of the Bill were not asking the establishment of a new principle. There were already the check weighman clauses of the Mines Regulation Act, and there were the "particulars" clauses in the Factory Acts for the protection of the interests of operatives in regard to payment for piecework. The system of weighing a certain number of ingots occasionally and then paying on the ascertained average, so far as the steel trade was concerned, was unsatisfactory for the reason that the weight of the material differed according to the carbon in the metal at the time of testing. If there was much carbon in the metal, then naturally the ingot was more solid and weighed more than another of a lower carbon. There was more expansion in the lower carbon than in the higher carbon, and he had found in his experience that employers, when they were, as a result of dissatisfaction, forced to weigh, were always careful to have the test weighing done from a low carbon, because it paid them to do so. The only fair method of weighing was to weigh every ingot, and the fact that there were three up-to-date works which did this showed that such a system was practicable. What was possible in these cases was possible in all. The latest and most up-to-date works were those erected at Cargo Fleet. If it was said that it was practically impossible to weigh each ingot the statement was of the most inaccurate and misleading character. Nothing could be more simple or more easily done in these particular works. For twenty years the steel workers had been agitating in this direction, but until the present Home Secretary promised a Departmental inquiry they had made little progress. When a deputation waited on him recently, the present Home Secretary inquired as to whether they had ever taken any action with the view of getting at any firm whom they had charged with unfair dealing. About two years ago they got affidavits sworn as to the manner in which the workmen in certain works were being robbed, but the works were owned by a limited liability company, who had neither a soul to be saved nor a body to be kicked, and they were informed by counsel that it was impossible to raise a criminal prosecution against the manager, because he was not pocketing any gain. In order to bring a criminal prosecution, it would be necessary to prove that he had gained by the transaction. He thought the Home Secretaries before whom the question had been brought had been with the workmen in regard to the principle they were seeking to establish. As to the custom in the tin-plate trade, the workmen had an arrangement with the employers that if a workman, who received the correct weight of metal for the purpose of making tin sheets, drew them light, on account of faulty workmanship, he might be penalised by the employer taking sheets to make up the weight for such light or faulty work. But the workman had no means of knowing or checking whether the iron put in was correct in weight or not. Some of the employers in South Wales had recognised that fact, and in three instances they had voluntarily given the men the privilege of putting on a check weigher to check the weights. If the iron went in light that was the fault of the employer, and the workman was not penalised. The workmen agreed to that, and, on the other hand, they said that if a workman, through negligent workmanship, ran the sheets light, he should be penalised. The deputation that waited on the Home Secretary a few weeks ago represented over 100,000 men, but that number did not cover the whole of the men whom a Bill of this kind would affect. Having looked into the question, he believed he was safe in saying that the measure affected at any rate 250,000 men, who would be directly benefited if the measure were carried. He and his friends were very much indebted to the Home Secretary for granting a Departmental inquiry. The workmen had nothing to fear, and everything to gain, by such a course of procedure. The promoters of the Bill, on whose behalf he spoke, would be perfectly prepared to adopt the idea of the Home Secretary that the Bill should be committed to Committee of the Whole House, so that it might be practically shelved for this session, in view of the fact that they had no desire to force legislation until the Departmental Committee had reported. He begged to second the Motion.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.) said this was a Bill which raised questions of very considerable importance, and certainly it was one which created throughout the country very widespread interest. The arguments for it had been very fairly stated by the two hon. Gentlemen who had already spoken. He was glad to think that the arguments for the Bill did not rest, speaking generally, on any allegation of malpractice on the part of the employers, but rather on the general broad ground of the defective system under which the men concerned had no precise and definite method of ascertaining exactly what wages were due to them. This question had been raised in his Department periodically since 1893. It was not a new question to him, because fourteen years ago, when he was Under Secretary at the Home Office, it was raised, and, looking back at the Papers, he found that in November, 1893, he argued that if it was right to adopt the checkweighman system in coal mines, it was right also that it should be adopted in other employments where the conditions were similar. He suggested to the then Home Secretary that he should receive a deputation on the subject, and his right hon. friend the present Chancellor of the Exchequer did in the following spring receive the first deputation. In reply to the deputation his right hon. friend said he agreed that where payment was by weight the process of ascertaining the weight should be above all suspicion; that he had complete sympathy with the object of the deputation, but that he could not promise legislation definitely until he had ascertained the views, in the first instance, of the employers. That Government came to an end. The Home Secretary in the next Government, who received deputations in 1897, 1898, and 1900, stated that he agreed with the opinion of his predecessors and he said, moreover, that a strong *primâ facie* case had been made out. He also said that he wanted to make further inquiry as to the views of the employers. Difficulties seemed to have been raised at that time and subsequently by the employers. They said that they had no objection to the appointment of checkweighmen, but that there were certain practical difficulties in the way which made the change undesirable. They said further that in view of the fact that there was practically no grievance, it was not worth while making any alteration in the system. Nothing further seemed to have been done for the next half-dozen years. He recollected receiving the deputation to which the hon. Gentlemen had alluded. That deputation presented the same case with perhaps greater force, and represented that there were short weights given by some employers, especially in iron and steel works. He said in answer to the deputation that he was anxious that the matter should be considered broadly so as to secure the greatest possible accuracy where wages were paid for piecework by weight without interfering with the necessities of an industry. It was really to attain that object that this Bill had been introduced. He cordially supported the Second Reading. Of course, he could not be committed to the clauses as they stood. But the Bill affirmed two principles—one, that in certain industries where men were paid by rates of weight or measurement they should be able to check the weights by a check weigher or deputy; and the other, that where men were paid by piece they should have particulars. He thought the House would assent to both those principles. So far as the question of particulars was concerned, his sincere wish was to deal with it as a whole as soon as possible. He had had experience of the excellent working of the particulars clause of the Act of 1895, and there was no earthly reason why that principle should not be made universal for all piecework. There were practical difficulties owing to the immense variety of trades concerned, but the Government were taking measures with a view, if possible, of bringing in some legislation by which they could make the principle of the particulars clause general. There were one or two weak points in the Bill. Its scope was too narrow. He saw no reason why it should be limited to the industries specified in the second clause. There were many industries in the Birmingham district which might be excluded from the operation of the Bill as it stood, and the measure did not include the loading and unloading of ships where the men were paid by weight. Their case and the case of other trades not included ought, he thought, to be considered. Then the Bill evaded the central difficulty of the question. It did not establish any precise method by which the exact weight was to be ascertained, but left the difficulty to be solved by the Home Office in framing and administering Rules. That task the Home Office could not undertake. They must get into closer relations with the different trades. Many industries working by different methods were concerned. It was desirable, if possible, to arrive at some common basis which would be accepted and applied by both masters and men without any friction or trouble. The Government thought it desirable, especially as the matters involved were highly technical, that they should have an expert inquiry. The contention of the iron and steel masters who were chiefly concerned in this matter, was that modern developments made weighing a matter of difficulty, that even half a minute's delay in the different processes which had to be gone through meant loss. His hon. friend denied that. That was one of the points the Government wanted to see settled by experts on both sides. Whatever difficulty there might be in establishing a suitable method, he thought modern ingenuity would be able to overcome it. There were also technical questions in connection with cement works, chalk quarries, and so forth. He proposed to set up a committee and submit to it, in the first instance, the case of the iron and steel trade; then the case of other trades. They might then be able to arrive at something which would afford a common basis for dealing with all cases where wages were paid by weight. The Committee, which was practically now made up, would comprise Mr. Ernest Hatch, chairman, a factory inspector, and Mr. Lloyd Morgan, the Member for West Carmarthen, who would form the neutral element on the Committee; and then the expert element, consisting of Messrs. Ainsworth and Eccles, representative members of the iron and steel trade, and, as representatives of the workmen, his hon. friend the Member for the Gorton Division of Lancashire and Alderman P. Walls, of Workington. He thought that Commttee would be very well capable of sifting the evidence and coming to some sound conclusion in connection with the different trades. The Government accepted the Second Reading of the Bill, and were also prepared to agree to the suggestion that it should go to a Committee of the Whole House. Whatever might be said as to the merits of the new Standing Order, he could assure the hon. Member for North Armagh that it was never intended that all Bills read a second time should necessarily go to a Grand Committee. There were many measures of a pioneer character which were simply brought forward for general discussion in order to open out public opinion on a certain principle. To send this Bill to a Committee would be of no practical use. Therefore he thought that it should be dealt with in the way suggested, and that when the psychological moment arrived it should receive with all dignity its discharge for the session. Meanwhile, the Committee would get to work, and as the result of its labours he hoped to be able to bring in next year a non-contentious Bill which would finally settle this matter which had been the subject of friction and unnecessary trouble for many years.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said he would support the Second Reading of the Bill and of the principle which it embodied; but as the Bill was to be hung up for some months, he wished to make a few observations which had occurried to him in reading the details of the measure. He did not agree with the view that the scope of the Bill was too narrow. The measure was drafted from the point of view of two or three particular trades, and he thought it would be unfortunate to include in it the loading and unloading of ships. If legislation were desired on that subject, it would be better left to the Board of Trade. In laying out new steel works, it would be feasible to arrange for a continuous system of checking and weighing, but there were many steel works against which no charge could be brought of ever having defrauded their people systematically, where it would be impossible to carry out a continuous system.

*Mr. HODGE said that the purpose of the Bill was simply to provide that the men who were paid by the ton or measurement should have a means of checking their work and so secure the amount of money which they had really earned.

Lord BALCARRES said he was satisfied with the explanation of the hon. Member, and he was much obliged for it. An hon. Member below the Gangway had said that he had sent out seventy circulars to steel works and he found that there were only three at which there were facilities for continuous measurement and weighing. In regard to Cowdenheath, he knew that in that particular steel works, in three out of five processes of steel-making there was an arrangement for estimating the weight of every ingot. With regard to the Committee, he would have been better pleased if it had consisted of three representatives of the iron and steel trade like the hon. Member for Gorton, and one Member of the Home Office to hold the scales even. He did not think these outside impartial men were required at all. Everybody knew what the difficulties were and the object to be attained, and he very much feared——

*Mr. GLADSTONE (interrupting) said the Committee would have to inquire into other things affecting distinct and separate trades, and they could not ask Members representing a particular trade to do that. What he proposed to do by way of experiment was really to adopt the principle of nucleus crews and to have three impartial men who could sit continuously and then Members representing particular trades who could go away when the inquiry in regard to the particular trade which they represented was finished and be replaced by members of another trade.

Lord BALCARRES said he understood then that there was to be a permanent committee and trade and expert members would be imported for each particular trade. That of course made all the difference, and he should think no difficulty would arise. He hoped, however, the draft rules would be published in good time during the present autumn so as to give those concerned an opportunity of considering the matter in a friendly manner before the Government Bill was introduced next year. There was no difficulty in the Bill, but only in the rules. He thought the Home Office would not be prejudiced in any way by taking the steel and iron trades into their confidence early and publishing the rules in good time. The principle was good, and he hoped the efforts of the right hon. Gentleman would lead to a good result.

*Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.) said he rose to express his satisfaction at the Home Office having committed itself fully to the principle that the wage earner should be able to find out what he had earned and what was due to him, and should not be obliged to take whatever was given him. This principle was embodied in the "Particulars Clause" of the Factory Act of 1895. He himself took some part in the Committee work of that Bill upstairs. He was satisfied that a large number of poor workers, women and young persons, were called upon to give their work from Monday to Saturday and take what was given to them without having any power whatever to ascertain whether they were receiving what was due to them or not. In his own constituency there were many young, poor, and ignorant workers who were bitterly disappointed at what they received, and who were unable to say whether they received enough for the work or not. The Bill touched the principle of the right of the worker to see that he got a satisfactory wage, and he heartily supported its Second Reading.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College) said he would not have intervened in the debate, but for the fact that it seemed to him from the remarks of the Home Secretary that while the right hon. Gentleman seemed willing to pass the Bill he was preaching its funeral sermon. The noble Lord said the Bill would be hung up for a few months. Had the noble Lord said a few years or even a decade he thought he would have been nearer the truth. The right hon. Gentleman contended that the Bill was too narrow; that the trades dealt with were not sufficient in number; that he would have the Bill considerably broadened, and he indicated in the latter part of his speech that he would appoint a Committee to inquire into the iron and steel trades.

*MR. GLADSTONE said that was not so. The Committee had an extremely limited function; they had only to inquire into and ascertain the best way of computing the wages.

MR. WATT said the right hon. Gentleman proposed to appoint this Committee for two or three trades first, and then a fresh Committee would be appointed to inquire into other three or four trades, and so on *ad infinitum.* They might reach the Day of Judgment before they reached the Act. This Parliament would not last for ever.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London): Hear, hear.

MR. WATT said the pendulum might swing back, and the next Parliament would not think of dealing with the iron and steel trades on the lines of this Bill. He expressed his regret that the Bill was likely to be always in the future and not in the present.

Question put, and agreed to. Bill committed to a Committee of the Whole House for Monday next.—(*Mr. George Roberts.*)

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) called attention to the fact that forty Members were not present.

House counted, and forty Members being found present,

INTESTATE HUSBAND'S ESTATE (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire), in moving the Second Reading, said the Bill was non-controversial and was supported by the Scottish Members of the House. All it did was to make a small alteration in the Law of Intestacy. At the present time, if a husband died, leaving no children, his property was divided into three shares if it was movable property, and the widow was entitled to one tierce or third of the amount, the remainder going to the husband's relations. While this might be perfectly fair in the case of large estates, it was extremely unfair in the case of small ones. If only a small amount was left it was highly probable that the widow had had a great deal to do with the saving of it, and it was extremely hard upon her that the bulk of it should pass away to other persons. In the case of heritable property, as it was termed in Scotland. or real property as it was called in England, the case might be even harder. In that case she was entitled to only one-third of the value of the cottage it might be, unless it was registered as the property of her husband, and it generally happened that a poor man was precisely the sort of person who was not likely to register property of that sort. That had been found very hard in cases of small property, and all the Bill proposed was to do for Scotland what was done for England by the Act of 1890—that was to say to enable, in small cases below £500, the widow to take the whole, and in cases above £500, for the widow to take £500, and that for the rest she should rank as she did at present and take one-third. He begged to move.

*MR. J. M. HENDERSON (Aberdeenshire, W.), in seconding, said the existing law on this point caused great hardship among the poor labouring people. He knew cases where working men, when they saved money, rather than risk their relatives coming in and taking it from their widows, gave their wives the money to bank in their own names. In such cases matters often became complicated owing to the wife dying first of all instead of last of all according to the Biblical law. It did not very much affect cases where only a little furniture was left, but where there was a little money in the bank the husband's relatives usually asserted their right to take their share. It was only right to assimilate the law of Scotland to the law of England in this matter. He begged to second the Motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Crombie.*)

SIR F. BANBURY said the object of this Bill was one to which few could object, but it was unfortunately another example of the evils which were likely to arise when private Members brought in Bills of this sort. Such a Bill, dealing with an important question with regard to property, ought not to be brought in except by a responsible member of the Government, for the reason that private Members were actuated by sentimental motives. Because they knew of grievances they rushed into legislation without having regard to the fact that, while that legislation might reduce the grievance they had in mind, it might bring about other grievances not contemplated by them. It was one of the many fatal objections to private Members bringing in important Bills that they were apt to consider only the particular grievance put before them. He was informed, in the first place, that the memorandum of this Bill was incorrect. The memorandum said "one-third of the heritage"; he was told it was not one-third of the heritage, but a life rent of one-third of the heritage. The hon. Gentleman who seconded the Motion said the Bill was to deal with the cases of poor people, but the hon. Member must remember that it would apply not only to poor people but to everybody. What would happen under the Bill in cases where there were marriage settlements? Notwithstanding the fact that there was a marriage settlement the widow would have £500, and the remainder would be divided, and she would take her share to provide for herself, although she was already provided for. It might be that the husband was maintaining a sister in ill health, or a brother who for some reason or other was not able to work, and that he had made no provision for the allowance he had been making to his brother or sister. Under the law as it at present stood they would be provided for but under this Bill the brother or sister would be deprived of the money which they would otherwise have inherited, and £500 would go to the widow already well provided for.

MR. J. M. HENDERSON: It is the same provision as in the Act of 1890 for England.

SIR F. BANBURY said he had not that Act before him and could not say whether that was so or not, but he heard it contradicted by an hon. Member below him. But supposing it was so, what had that to do with it? Was it suggested that, because there was injustice in England, injustice should be perpetrated in Scotland? The proper course to take in that case would be to bring in a Bill to remedy the injustice in England and not one to perpetrate the injustice in Scotland. In Clause 5 an arbitrary provision was made as to the number of years purchase at which the value of the property was to be taken. Why should twenty years purchase be taken? He was informed that in many cases, especially in such cases as the mover and seconder had in mind, the heritable property was in a very dilapidated state and not worth anything like twenty years purchase. Why had a number of years been taken instead of the market value of the property at the time of the husband's death? The Bill would in many cases deprive the heirs of any proportion which they would be entitled to receive. Had he been a lawyer, he would, no doubt, have been able to detect many more defects in the Bill, and he, therefore, hoped the Government would introduce a properly drafted measure in lieu of the one now before the House.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. THOMAS SHAW, Hawick Burghs) said he did not think the hon. Member for the City of London need apologise for not being a lawyer, because he had advanced his objections in a plain commonsense manner which might not have been the case had he belonged to the legal profession. Still, every one of the points raised by the hon. Baronet was answered by the procedure in the English Act of 1890. That Act was introduced by a private Member, and the only speech delivered on it was that by the most non-Party man of the last generation, Lord Bramwell. Some complaint had been made of the draughtsmanship of the measure. He had looked into that matter and averred that the Bill was framed in the proper legal terminology. He hoped that before the Committee stage was reached the learned societies in Scotland would do him the honour of reviewing it, and on behalf of the Government he would be glad to attend to all matters of draughtsmanship. As to the hon. Baronet's point regarding the twenty years valuation, it was highly important that in a matter of succession and valuation of real and other estate in Scotland, the law of the two countries should not be different. This Bill had been drawn on the lines of the Act of 1890. He entirely agreed that the time had come for assimilating the laws of the two countries. As to the hon. Baronet's allegation of injustice, the matter was all the other way. In small estates of this kind, where the total value was £500 or under, what was proposed was not to interfere with the discretion of the testator—he could leave the property to whom he liked subject to the ordinary law of Scotland. It was proposed to interfere when there was a direct issue of the deceased, and to deal with the hard case where collateral relatives came in in order to take away one-half of the property from the widow. If the estate was £500 or under, England had said it was a fair thing that, confronting, as she might do, very distant relatives of the husband, she should be entitled to at least £500. That would avoid hardships sometimes of a serious kind, and he could hardly imagine there would be any serious objection to it. As to the question of marriage settlements, they were prepared in Scotland on the footing that the rights granted to the relict were exclusive of other rights of succession which she might have. If a wife was provided for by marriage settlement that marriage settlement was held to be part of the law of contract and was enforced against all distribution of the estate after the testator's death. On that point no trouble would arise. The Bill was a sound Bill; it was small, but it dealt with certain injustices, and he hoped the House would agree to the Second Reading.

LORD BALCARRES said that although the measure dealt with Scotland, questions would arise in regard to property in England, and therefore he hoped the Bill would not be sent to the Scottish Commitee. He appealed to the Speaker to say whether the Bill would in the ordinary course of things go to the Scottish Committee.

*MR. SPEAKER said that somebody must decide, under the new standing order, what Bills should go to the Scottish Grand Committee, and he had come to the conclusion that he was the only person in a position to decide. It would be his duty to decide, if this Bill were sent upstairs, whether it related exclusively to Scotland or not; and if he decided in the affirmative, a notification of the reference of the Bill to the Scottish Grand Committee would appear in the Votes and Proceedings.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Bill be committed to a Committee of the Whole House."—(*Lord Balcarres.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 8; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 155.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Rt Hn. Sir Alex. F.
Ashley, W. W.
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Duncan, Robert (Lanark, Gov'n
Smith, F.E. (Liverpool, Walton
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Lord Balcarres and Sir Frederick Banbury.

NOES.

Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barnard, E. B.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Beale, W. P.
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S.Geo.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Boland, John
Brodie, H. C.
Brooke, Stopford
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, E.Gr'st'd)
Crean, Eugene
Crooks, William
Delany, William
Donelan, Captain A.
Duffy, William J.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Flynn, James Christopher
Gill, A. H.
Ginnell, L.
Glendinning, R. G.
Grant, Corrie
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Hayden, John Patrick
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hudson, Walter
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Lundon, W.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
MacVeagh, Jeremiah (Down, S.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.
M'Killop, W.
Maddison, Frederick
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Murphy, John
Nicholls, George

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n)
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rutherford, V. H. (Brentford)
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sheehy, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Smyth, Thomas F.(Leitrim,S.)
Stanley,Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Thorne, William
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Wardle, George J.
Watt, Henry A.
White, George (Norfolk)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson,W.T. (Westhoughton)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Mr. Crombie and Mr. John Henderson.

Bill committed to a Standing Committee.

LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

*SIR WILLIAM HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham), in moving the Second Reading of the Limited Partnerships Bill, said it was a measure for which the commercial opinion of the country had been agitating for the last thirty years, because it was felt that, for lack of some such proposal, commercial development had been considerably hampered and hindered. In the last session of Parliament this measure had the good fortune to pass through the House of Lords, an Assembly which at times could do very expeditious work, especially with a measure of a non-contentious character. But, unfortunately, when the Bill came down to the House of Commons there was so much pressure of business that it was unable to make any progress. Some work, however, was done last session while the Bill was on the Order Paper; in that the draftsmen of the Board of Trade paid the closest attention to its provisions, and suggested several alterations which had been embodied in the Bill. In addition to that there were the names of some conspicuous lawyers absent from the Bill last year, but which were present this year. Some of those lawyers were rather opposed to the measure at the outset, but certain alterations having been made in it, they were now strongly in its favour, and, therefore, he was now able to quote the great authority of the hon. Member for Kingston on the one side and of the hon. Member for Reading on the other, than whom there were few, if any, greater authorities at the Bar on a question such as that with which this Bill dealt. He was glad also to know that the attitude of the Government was entirely friendly to the measure. He had conversed with the Attorney General, and he felt sure that if he had been present the hon. and learned Gentleman would have pronounced his benediction on the Bill. The object of the measure was to make it safe for a man with capital to furnish financial assistance to a firm, on the footing that he was to be remunerated for the employment of his capital by receiving a share of any profit which might be realised in the business, without jeopardising his whole fortune in the event of the business going wrong. At present there was considerable risk of a capitalist being penalised in that way, and the consequence had been that many men preferred to keep their money lying idle rather than put it into a business, because if a capitalist lent his money in that way—he was so advised—and sought to tender any assistance in the conduct of the business, even in a casual degree, he ran very considerable risk of being adjudged a full partner if things went wrong. This Bill set up a sort of intermediate stage between a limited company and a private firm. It allowed one or more partners to be limited partners, and the rest must be full partners. This, obviously, would be a very great convenience in the case of families, perhaps, who wished to keep businesses in their own hands, or as an arrangement between friends, who, themselves in possession of money, were disposed to help others who might have brains, but were rather short of capital, and, in that way, business might be very substantially developed. They had seen an instance during the present session of the advantage that might accrue from trying to learn from our foreign competitors. When the Patents Bill was introduced by the President of the Board of Trade, one of the arguments, and it was a strong and irresistible argument, was that we were considerably behind other nations in the matter of patent legislation. Exactly the same remark might be made in regard to limited partnerships, because our principal foreign competitors had already this system in vogue. In France they had what was called a partnership *en commandite.* The result was that businesses had been developed to huge dimensions which perhaps would never have got their start had they not been assisted by this form of partnership. He could give specific instances of very substantial businesses indeed which had been developed in this way. A Departmental Committee sat a short time ago to deal with the question of Joint Stock Company Law. It was a very competent Committee which sat for eighteen months, and the result of its Report was that the Companies Bill had been introduced which was now under consideration in another place. There was one clause in the Report of the Joint Stock Company Committee which specifically referred to this Limited Partnerships Bill and referred to it with entire approval. Besides business men, the banking community were strongly in favour of it, and no wonder, because it opened the door to the profitable employment of some of their idle funds. The House of Lords' Bill last session was in charge of Lord Avebury. He had personally received a good many communications from various Chambers of Commerce in favour of the Bill, and also a petition from the Glasgow and West of Scotland Guardian Society for the Protection of Trade, in which occurred this sentence—

> "That in the opinion of your petitioners the passing of this measure would be of the greatest benefit to the trading community of the country."

Another society in Scotland had expressed a rather unfavourable opinion in regard to the measure, for the reason that the Bill did not go far enough. They urged that the powers of limited partners should be extended beyond the provisions laid down in this particular Bill. He agreed with that criticism, because he thought the limited partners ought not to have their powers restricted merely to inspecting books, and to advising thereon. When the Bill came before the Committee he would be very glad indeed to support an extension of the powers of limited partners. The Bill was not at all heroic in its nature, nor exciting in its provisions. Some would say it was small and very unimportant. The House knew that it often happened that small Bills were at great disadvantage because they did not lend themselves to electoral purposes nor to dramatic displays on the platform. It would be impossible for an orator to move great masses of people to enthusiasm in regard to a measure of this kind, and for that reason much of the impetus derived from public opinion was lacking in the present case. And yet the potentialities of a Bill like this were often immense. Such a measure, in his opinion, might have a very striking effect, because it would tap reservoirs of accumulated capital and thus render incalculable service in encouraging enterprise, extending trade, and increasing the employment of labour. There was no better way of dealing with the problem of the unemployed than by establishing new industries which were likely to be permanent in their benefits, without being pauperising in their character. He begged to move the Second Reading of this Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR F. BANBURY said the hon. Gentleman had given a very clear statement of the object of the Bill, and the effect it would have if passed into law. This was an exception to the general rule of Bills brought in by private Members. He objected to the habit of private Members bringing in Bills, because the House generally saw only one side, and had very little experience of the effect they would have. But the hon. Gentleman who had moved the Second Reading of this Bill was thoroughly conversant with the subject, and although, as he said, it was one which would not create enthusiasm, yet it was an extremely useful measure and one which he was quite competent to bring in. For the last fifty years a system somewhat similar to that which was proposed had existed in France with very good results. He had had some experience of businesses controlled and advanced by such a system, and not having heard of any bad effects resulting from it, he would certainly support this Bill.

For a number of years there had been a great prejudice against any Bills of this sort, but he thought it had arisen from the conservative nature of Englishmen about their businesses. One objection which had always been raised was that people would not know who the limited partner was, or that a person was a partner only to a limited extent. Clause 5 provided that every limited partnership must be registered. He did not quite know who was going to keep the register. The Bill also provided that the statements should be filed in the Registrar's office where they could be inspected by any person desirous of inspecting them. Very often people were rather careless in business, and in the hurry of carrying through a transaction they might forget that the firm consisted only of limited partners whose means were not very great. He gathered that the amount of capital put into the firm by a partner would be stated when he filed his statement.

*SIR WILLIAM HOLLAND: Undoubtedly, and the term as well.

SIR F. BANBURY said the only objection would be that people might be too careless or too lazy to go to the Registrar's office to find out the actual state of affairs. That objection had been advanced before, but he did not think there was very much in it, and if this Bill became effective such an objection would probably disappear altogether. He thought the Bill provided a scheme which would be successful, if there was any money left in the country. At the present moment money was going out of the country very fast, and it should not be forgotten that there would be so little left that this Bill might not be taken any advantage of at all. Some modifications might be required in Committee, and he had an idea that it was not the same Bill as the one which was introduced last year. The general principle of the measure, however, had his approval and he would support the Second Reading.

*SIR A. TORRANCE (Glasgow, Central) said he had had forty-three years experience in the City of London, and when the hon. Member spoke of reservoirs of accumulated capital he touched a question which he was very sore upon. Succesful businesses had only been created by enterprise, and these reservoirs would lead to money being lent to suit the purposes of the lender. He would, however, want to know more about the matter before he could consent to such a state of things. Considerable speculation had been going on and business men might do well one year and badly another, and this limited liability system was a most dangerous one. He knew of a firm in London which had failed, and the debenture holders practically got all the money. This seemed to him to be a dangerous principle, and it would have to be very much better explained before he could accept the principle of limited partnership set forth in this measure.

SIR F. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich) said that if a man desired to help a friend to start or extend a business he was not able to do so without risk to himself unless it was registered as a limited liability company. If a man desired to help a friend in that way and get some recompense in the shape of a share of the profits he became a partner, and was liable to the extent of every halfpenny he possessed in the world. Therefore he thought it was desirable that a man should be able to put money into a business and reap some recompense out of the profit without having the whole of his estate made liable for any default or failure of his partners to do their work properly. He regretted that the Bill had not come on at a time when more Members of the House were present, in order that more hon. Members could have expressed their views. The Bill was really a very important departure. It seemed to him that one of the clauses in particular might lead to some loss to people who were doing business with a firm because they knew that a certain capitalist had money in it. He did not believe that a partner ought to be able to draw his money out without its being advertised that he had ceased to be a partner in the firm. There were cases in which men of good reputation became members of firms, and afterwards became bankrupt, and he thought some provision should be made for cases of that sort. There were other clauses in the Bill which he thought required very careful scrutiny, and although he was prepared to support the Bill he regretted that the Second Reading had not received the scrutiny and criticism of a larger House.

MR. BEALE (Ayrshire, S.) said there was only one thing he had heard in the debate which called for an answer. His hon. friend apprehended that this Bill might possibly do a certain amount of mischief which arose already from the Limited Liability Bill and other Acts. The fact was that this Bill would only play a very small part, and he doubted whether it would make a substantial difference in the amount of money that was put into trading concerns on those terms. He wished to say a word as to the principle on which the danger of liability rested when a man put his money into a concern and wished to be a sleeping partner. He was not liable merely because he had put money in and agreed to take in return a share of the profits. As a matter of fact he was only liable as a partner if, in addition to his share of profits, there was an agency between him and the other members of the firm. During his experience he had never found the slightest difficulty in framing an agreement to avoid all dangers of that kind. Often when men put their money into business they insisted upon mixing themselves up in the management and sometimes held themselves out as men with influence who could control the other partners or as being in the position of agents for the other members of the firm, or else implying that the other members of the firm were agents for them. This new legislation ought to be directed towards finding an easy way of expressing what the obligations of the sleeping partner were, and the most valuable thing in the Bill was the clause which said that he might examine books. Let them suppose that a man acted in such a way as to hold himself out to be a partner. People might then rely upon his credit, and he was not sure whether under Clause 7 there was a provision which did not come in conflict with the end of sub-section 2 of Section 4 which said he was not to be liable beyond the amount contributed by him. The Bill ought to be considered with a view to prevent creditors relying on a man's position and credit when he was not really liable, and, on the other hand, to remove the pitfalls which acted unfairly in the case of a man who put his money into a concern as a sleeping partner.

SIR A. ACLAND-HOOD (Somersetshire, Wellington) said there seemed to be a great difference of opinion in regard to this measure, especially amongst business men. It was obviously a Bill of great importance, and therefore he did not think the House of Commons ought to pass it in a hurry after a few minutes discussion on a Friday afternoon, especially when the great bulk of hon. Members had gone elsewhere on pleasure bent. There were seventeen clauses in the Bill, and many of them raised important points. Under one of the clauses a new offence was created for which the unfortunate victim would be liable to two years hard labour. He had always held that the House should be very careful in creating new offences. At the present moment the Board of Trade and the Treasury were not represented, nor was there anyone present representing the English Law Officers. In these circumstances he thought that it was in the interest of the business men of the country that he should move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. BRIDGEMAN (Shropshire, Oswestry) seconded the Motion.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."—(*Sir A. Acland Hood*).

THE UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. HERBERT SAMUEL, Yorkshire, Cleveland) said that this Bill was not in any way connected with his Department, but at the same time all Ministers were in some degree responsible for one another, they were in a partnership, however limited, and, therefore, he ventured on this occasion, feeling sure that his colleagues of the Board of Trade would approve of his action, to express the desire that this Bill should pass the Second Reading. The President of the Board of Trade had been detained at a meeting of the Cabinet, and that prevented his being in the House. If the Bill were really contentious, he would have agreed with the right hon. Gentleman as to the undesirability of its passing the Second Reading under the circumstances of the moment, but it had been generally regarded as an agreed Bill. He had reason to believe from personal knowledge that it was very greatly desired among bankers in the City of London, generally. It passed last year through the House of Lords. The present Lord Chancellor had expressed warm approval of the Bill. It was a measure which received in this House the support of the hon. Baronet the Member for the City of London and, therefore, they might be sure that it could not have anything very objectionable or contentious in it. The Board of Trade approved of the Bill and desired its passage. They had been in close consultation with the hon. Member who had moved the Second Reading. He trusted the House would read the Bill a second time.

Question put, and negatived.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to a Standing Committee.

JURORS (EXPENSES) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.), in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, said its object was to provide for the payment of the expenses of jurors who attended assizes and quarter sessions. It was not intended to remunerate jurors for the services they rendered, but merely to provide the out of pocket expenses incurred by jurymen in the discharge of their duties. He was sorry for many reasons that the attendance in the House was so thin, for the question with which the Bill dealt was not only important, but it was one in which large classes of people were considerably interested. The modest proposal of the Bill was that jurymen who attended assizes and quarter sessions should be paid their travelling expenses, and the other expenses incurred if they had to spend a night away from home. The way in which that was provided for in the Bill was quite simple. The county council or the borough council had to make a scale of allowances for each night a juryman was away from home, and of the sum which he was to receive per mile for travelling expenses. That scale of charges was to be submitted to the Home Office for approval. The other part of the Bill dealt with the machinery by which that was to be carried out. The Bill only applied to England and Wales. The question of the payment of the expenses of jurymen had not been discussed in the House during the eighteen years he had been a Member, but it had been before the House a considerable number of years ago. In 1868 the question was referred to a Select Committee. That Committee reported in favour of the payment to special jurors of £1 1s., and to common jurors of 10s. 6d. a day. The recommendations of the Select Committee were embodied in an Act of Parliament in 1870, but difficulty arose with regard to machinery when the assizes were going on, and the payments could not be made. In 1871 the Attorney-General of the day moved the repeal of the section which provided for the payments. In doing so he intimated that he himself, and the Government he represented, agreed that the payments should be made, but that the repeal of the section was moved because of the difficulty which had arisen in the matter of machinery. It was the intention of the Government in the following year to deal with the subject by legislation, but from that day to this the question had never been dealt with. He submitted that there was a strong case now why jurymen should be paid their expenses when attending assizes. The circumstances were quite different now from what they were years ago. The work had vastly increased.

And notice being taken at twenty minutes before Three of the Clock that 40 Members were not present, the House was told by Mr. Deputy-Speaker, and 19 Members only being present, Mr. Deputy Speaker retired from the Chair until Four of the Clock, when the House was again told by Mr. Speaker, and 33 Members only being present, the House was adjourned by Mr. Speaker without a Question first put till Monday next.

Adjourned at Four o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Monday, 6th May, 1907.

The Lord Hawke took the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

The Lord Chancellor acquainted the House, That the Clerk of the Parliaments had laid upon the Table the Certificates from the Examiners that the further Standing Orders applicable to the following Bills have been complied with:—Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 1) [h.l.]; Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (Surrey, etc.) [h.l.]; Port Talbot Railway and Docks; South-Eastern, and London, Chatham and Dover Railways; Taff Vale Railway; London and North-Western Railway (Superannuation Fund); Grays and Tilbury Gas; Swansea Harbour.

Also the Certificates that no further Standing Orders are applicable to the following Bills:—Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1); Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2).

The same were ordered to lie on the Table.

Maidstone Gas Bill: The Chairman of Committees informed the House that the opposition to the Bill was withdrawn. The order made on the 24th of April last discharged, and Bill committed.

Sutton Coldfield Rectory Bill [h.l.]; Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill [h.l.]; Kendal Corporation Bill [h.l.]; Western Valleys (Monmouthshire) Sewerage Board Bill [h.l.]; Metropolitan Railway (Pension Fund) Bill [h.l.].—Read 3^{a}, and passed, and sent to the Commons.

Metropolitan Water Board (Charges etc.) Bill; Metropolitan Water Board (Various Powers) Bill.—Report from the Committee of Selection, That the Viscount Ridley be proposed to the House as a member of the Joint Committee on the said Bills in the place of the Lord Leith of Fyvie; read, and agreed to.

Brighouse Corporation Bill; Burnley Corporation Bill; Shanklin Gas Bill.—Brought from the Commons, read 1^{a}, and referred to the Examiners.

Canal Tolls and Charges (New Junction Canal) Order Confirmation Bill [h.l.].—Read 2^{a} (according to order).

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.—Read 2^{a} (according to order), and committed.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TRANSVAAL.

Correspondence relating to the introduction of Chinese labourers into the Transvaal in excess of the number of licences issued.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Reports and Statistics relating to continuation classes and central institutions, for the year 1905–1906.

MISCELLANEOUS No. 2. (1907.)

Correspondence respecting the International Conference on the White Slave Traffic, held in Paris, October, 1906.

TRADE REPORTS: ANNUAL SERIES.

No. 3773. France (Rouen).

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Calendar of the manuscripts of the Marquess of Bath, preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire. Vol. II.

Report on the manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., preserved at Welbeck Abbey. Vol. VIII.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (SCOTLAND).

Twelfth Annual Report of the Local Government Board for Scotland, 1906.

ALIENS ACT, 1905.

First Annual Report of His Majesty's Inspector under the Aliens Act (Part I.), and a statement with regard to the Expulsion of Aliens (Part II.), in respect of the year 1906.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

EDUCATION COMMISSIONERS (IRELAND).

Annual Report for the year 1906.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1897.

Ninth Annual Report of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Board to the Secretary for Scotland.

Presented (by command), and ordered to lie on the Table.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND) PENSION FUND.

Account of receipts and payments in respect of the capital and income of the above fund, for the year ended 31st December, 1906.

ARKLOW HARBOUR.

Report of the Arklow Harbour Commissioners and Statement of Accounts for 1906.

SUPERANNUATION.

Treasury Minute, dated 30th April, 1907, declaring that Frederick Campion Forger, King's Yard, Gibraltar, War Office, was appointed without a civil service certificate through inadvertence on the part of the head of his department.

Laid before the House (pursuant to Act), and ordered to lie on the Table.

PUBLIC BILLS.

Return respecting. Laid before the House (pursuant to Order of the 28th of February last), and to be printed. (No. 51.)

HOUSE OF LORDS (REFORM) BILL [H.L.].

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

*LORD NEWTON: My Lords, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill it will readily be believed that I do so under a feeling of considerable trepidation, being conscious, for one thing, of the ridicule which invariably attaches to amateur constitution-makers, and, in the second place, of the painful fact that there are a certain number of my friends, whose opinion I respect, who do not consider the present moment opportune for the introduction of a measure of this description. Apparently that is a view which is shared by the Government, judging by the Notice which appears on the Paper. All I have to say is that if I am told that this Bill would have been more opportune several years ago I am in entire agreement with that opinion; but, on the other hand, I am unable to see that the Bill would be more opportune a month or possibly even a year hence than it is at the present moment. And perhaps I may be forgiven for expressing the belief that many of those who find my action inopportune at the present moment might find it equally inopportune at any subsequent period.

I am further given to understand that there are a certain number of noble Lords who resent the idea of my bringing in a measure of this description because they do not consider that my title is a sufficiently antique one to justify my holding any opinion whatever on this matter. If this remarkable doctrine were to prevail it is quite evident that many Peers of recent creation would be precluded from delivering any opinion upon such questions as the constitution of this House. But perhaps I may mollify some of my critics if I point out that I am not in reality proposing anything new or revolutionary. I do not set up as being a constructive genius. I do not lay even a small claim to any kind of originality. All I have done is to adopt ideas which have been frequently put forward. These ideas I have endeavoured to embody in the Bill, and in support of this view I would refer the House to those projects of reforms which have been put forward within comparatively recent times. In 1884 the noble Earl on the Cross Benches, Lord Rosebery, in a speech which has become historical, moved for a Committee to consider the best means of promoting the efficiency of this House. That Motion was defeated by seventy-seven to thirty-eight votes. Again, in 1888, the noble Earl, no doubt invigorated by a period of office, moved for a Committee to inquire into the constitution of the House, and that Motion was again defeated by ninety-seven to forty-seven votes. In the same year another noble Earl, Lord Dunraven, introduced a highly ingenious and complicated measure of reform, which was withdrawn on the assurance of the late Lord Salisbury that he was prepared to deal with the question himself. In the same session, the late Lord Salisbury accordingly introduced two Bills, one for the creation of life Peers, and the other—usually described as "the black sheep Bill"—providing for the discontinuance of writs. The Second Reading of both of these Bills was taken unopposed, but the Bills were immediately withdrawn, because it was threatened that there would be considerable opposition to them in another place. In March, 1889, the late Lord Carnarvon introduced another "black sheep Bill," which was defeated by seventy-three to fourteen votes; and since that day nothing whatever has been attempted. Anybody who reads those debates cannot, I think, help being struck with certain features in them, the admirable nature of the speeches which were delivered, the short duration of the debates, and the scanty numbers of Peers who voted on those occasions; and I think it would be difficult to find a better argument than that in favour of the reduction of our numbers. But what is of more importance than that, from my point of view, is that nearly every speech which was made contains justification for the Bill to which I am now asking your Lordships to give a Second Reading.

My action is not based upon the opinions of the noble Earl Lord Rosebery, or upon those of the noble Earl Lord Dunraven. If you look at speeches made by men of such divergent political opinions as the late Lord Salisbury, the late Lord Granville, the late Mr. W. H. Smith, the late Lord Kimberley, the present Lord Curzon, the late Lord Derby, and even my noble friend Lord Wemyss, who is not usually regarded as an apostle of progress, you will find either a justification for what I am doing or admittance of certain defects and proposals for remedying those defects. I will go further. I will undertake to say there is hardly a speaker who, even in the glow of after-dinner oratory, when defending this House, does not begin his remarks by saying that there are certain changes which he would like to see introduced. I will quote a highly significant passage from a speech by the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition, a man who is not prone to make rash utterances. The noble Marquess in the early part of the year, on the occasion, I think, on which he became a grocer, made use of these words—

> "I am quite ready to admit that the hereditary principle, which is already very greatly modified, might be further modified by a more liberal reinforcement from the outside."

And the noble Marquess continued—

> "I see no reason why the House of Lords should not delegate to what I may call the working bees of the hive a larger share of the responsibility for, at any rate, some part of the business which we conduct. Changes of this kind are changes which, I believe, you will find the House of Lords always ready to discuss with an open mind and with a sincere desire that no effort may be spared to render it as efficient as possible for the purpose of the great task which falls to its lot under the Constitution."

I hope this spirit will be apparent in the course of the debate.

Now, what are the principal, indeed the only, criticisms worth considering which are levelled at this House? I think I may summarise them under three heads—undue numbers and scanty attendance, absence of representatives of important classes, and the excessive predominance of one political Party.

I will now turn to the Bill. Clauses 1 and 2 form an attempt to deal with the difficulty of excessive size by a process of selection, by a modification of the hereditary principle. The suggestion is that writs should only be issued to Peers who under the Bill are "qualified." Here I feel that I ought to apologise for the somewhat alarming provision that appears in the Bill—namely, that this is to come into operation on the termination of the present session. As a matter of fact, I only put this in in order to show my anxiety, having noticed that the Government had frequently taken the opportunity of asserting that they meant to remain a long time in office, that this matter should be dealt with without delay. The definition of a qualified Peer will be found in the Schedule; and I am quite aware of the fact that all Schedules of this kind bear an invidious, I might almost say, a ridiculous character. I can well understand, in regard to this particular

Schedule, for instance, that an ex-Viceroy might deem it somewhat derogatory to be classed with a mere Under-Secretary, and, on the other hand, I can well believe that an ex-Cabinet Minister, or a present Cabinet Minister, as far as that goes, might think it somewhat undignified to be classed with an ordinary obscure Peer whose only qualification is that he had been returned twice to the House of Commons. But inconsistencies of this kind are, I am afraid, unavoidable. The ideal Second Chamber, no doubt, would consist solely of most distinguished personages—ex-Viceroys, ex-Ambassadors, Judges, and so forth, reinforced, perhaps, by, if I may venture so to term them, versatile and accomplished sages of the type of Lord Courtney and Lord Avebury.

This Schedule is, I venture to think, framed on a comprehensive scale. It retains not only the classes I have enumerated, but it also retains as qualified Peers, Irish Peers, and created Peers—that is to say the first made Peers. But I am told that it is not comprehensive enough. I have been told, for instance, that it ought to include Privy Councillors. It appears to me that there is obvious objection to that course. The Privy Council is an office which should be maintained at the highest possible level, and there would obviously be a tendency to flood it in order to add to the numbers of the House of Lords. But I have another reason, and it is that if you study the list of the Privy Council you will find that there are certain members of that body who have extremely little political experience, whatever their other qualifications may be; and the object that, at all events, I am striving at is to retain in this House those persons who have had as much political experience as possible.

Then, again, I am told there is no sense in qualifying a Peer because he happened to have been returned twice to the House of Commons, and that once ought to be sufficient. That is an argument the validity of which I am not prepared to admit. To begin with, there are a very large number of Peers who have been Members of Parliament only once. They amount to something like 170. But it stands to reason that a man might be returned to the House of Commons by something almost approaching an accident. He might float into Parliament upon a khaki or Chinese labour wave, and his term might be a very short one. On the other hand, a man who has been returned twice to Parliament has, in every probability, fought other contests, and he is bound to have acquired a certain amount of experience which ought to be valuable to him in after-life.

Lord Newton.

Now I pass from qualified Peers to Clause 3, which deals with those persons who are somewhat unpolitely described as unqualified Peers. The principle adopted in this clause is that the unqualified Peers should elect one-fourth of their number at the beginning of each Parliament, on the same principle as that which prevails in regard to Scottish Peers. This principle of delegation is one which has been constantly urged, and it appears to me to meet in the least objectionable manner the difficulty of selection and also the difficulty of dealing with unfit Peers—if there are such persons—and absentee Peers. As we are likely to hear, and already do hear, a good deal about the question of absentees, and as it is not the slightest use to suppress these figures, I will just shortly put before the House the leading facts. This House consists of, roughly speaking, 600 Members. Of these over eighty—eighty-two, I think—have never taken the Oath. Last session the largest number attending was on 29th October, when there were 312 Peers who voted. On the next day there were 293, and the numbers continued to oscillate with a slightly diminishing tendency until, in the critical division on December 19th, there were 190 present. I should like to add that the Private Bill Committee work of this House is performed by less than 100 Members. It is evident from these figures that there is a large balance of what I may term redundant Peers, who might disappear without any very great harm being done. I do not mean to imply anything offensive with regard to these noble Lords, but I think their absence would hardly be noticed. In fact, I would venture to say they never would be missed so far as the division lists are concerned. You may divide the Members of this

House into three classes—the regular attendants, the irregular attendants, and those who do not attend at all. I do not claim any sort of merit for those Peers who attend regularly. They attend regularly because they are officials and are paid, or else because they like it. There is no compulsion. On the other hand, it is quite plain that there are a number of Peers who do not care about political life, and who show their want of affection for it by keeping away from this House. Here you have an example of the weakness of the hereditary principle. My noble friend Lord Rosebery once remarked with great truth that—

> "The hereditary principle makes legislators of men who do not wish to be legislators, and Peers of men who do not wish to be Peers."

The position of a reluctant or unwilling Peer is really one of the most remarkable positions in the world. Once a Peer always a Peer. Monarchs can abdicate and have done so; directors of companies, if they do not attend, are forced to retire; Members of Parliament, if they do not put in an appearance, are probably brought to book by their constituents. The only analogous position that I can think of at the present moment to that of reluctant Peers is the position of a High Sheriff. But, after all, the High Sheriff, though he has office deliberately thrust upon him, is only obliged to assume that office for a year, and he can get out of that on the payment of a fine.

There is no doubt an immense amount of rubbish and nonsense talked on platforms—on Radical platforms, of course—about the privileged classes; but if there is one undoubted privilege it is that of being born with the right to legislate for one's fellow-countrymen; and if persons born with this right do not choose to exercise it, I do not really see that they have any cause of complaint if it is taken from them, more especially if it is taken from them in the extremely painless and unobjectionable manner which I propose in this Bill. Proposals have been introduced into this House for the expulsion of undesirable Peers. Under this Bill, however, it would be unnecessary to perform such an invidious action at all. Any Peer who did not attend or might be considered unsuitable would not be elected or, if elected and proved unsuitable, would not be re-elected.

This principle of delegation has been met with two objections. I am told for instance, that the principle, if adopted, will make this House more Tory than ever. I recognise as clearly as anybody else the impossibility of turning this House into a Liberal assembly. I believe that if four or five hundred tradespeople, stockbrokers, or anybody you could think of, selected at haphazard, were put in our places they would arrive at very much the same decision in the long run as we ourselves do. I go further and say that if you took four or five hundred Gentlemen from the Government side in the House of Commons and put them here you would find a most extraordinary change in their opinions. The task of keeping Liberalism even alive in this Chamber is difficult enough, and I notice that even those sturdy democrats who are introduced into our midst are apt to show signs of wear and tear and deterioration rather like those exotics which are brought at vast expense by collectors to this country, and which gradually lose their brilliant hues amidst their new and more dingy surroundings.

But in order to prove how unfounded is the charge that I wish to make this House more Tory than it already is, I would like to point out that, on the contrary, this Bill shows a most marked solicitude for the Liberal Party. I have gone into the figures as closely as I am able, and, making every allowance for doubtfuls, I cannot bring the number of Liberal Peers to more than seventy—that is to say, barely one-eighth of the entire House. Of these twenty-five are created Peers and twenty-five are Peers who have been connected with the Government in some way or other, and therefore both these classes of Peers would be included amongst the qualified Peers. That only leaves about twenty other Peers in whom, if I may use the expression, the pure flame of Liberalism burns unfanned by official recognition in any shape or form. Anybody who studies the Bill will observe that I have made most careful provision for these Liberal Peers. Their retention in this Assembly is secured under a system of minority voting. Upon this question of minority voting I had recourse to my noble friend opposite, Lord Courtney, whom I asked to propound for me a satisfactory way of ensuring this minority representation. My noble friend was kind enough to point out that it was the simplest thing in the world, that it could be done by some process by which Peers were to be divided into groups of threes or fours and so elect their representatives. But, admirable as this plan no doubt is, I did not feel myself competent to present it in the best light to the House, and I have therefore relied upon the simpler plan of the cumulative vote. Under the cumulative vote it is perfectly obvious that all the Liberal Peers can be retained without any difficulty, and if anybody chooses to find fault with the cumulative vote I shall be only too pleased, in the somewhat doubtful contingency of this portion of the Bill ever being reached, to hand it over to my noble friend opposite, who, with the collaboration of Lord Avebury on this side of the House, may evolve some more suitable method of retaining the Liberal Peers now in the House. Under a system of life Peerages and ordinary created Peerages I calculate that if they were given five years they would reach a total of at least 150, and therefore their position would be infinitely better proportionately than it is at this moment. I have roughly estimated the number of qualified Peers at about 230, and of representative Peers at anything between ninety and 100.

The other objection which has been taken to this provision is that all capable and enterprising Peers who are able to do so will offer themselves as candidates for the House of Commons. Personally I feel extremely little apprehension on that score. It always appears to me that those aspirations and regrets which we occasionally hear indulged in by noble Lords that they are not sitting in another place bear an after-dinner ring. I know that there is a widespread belief that this House is full of what I may term caged eagles, some young and some middle-aged, who are only too anxious to escape from their gilded prison. I very much doubt the existence of these persons. Looking, for instance, at the two Front Benches it does not occur to me at this moment that there is any noble Lord who would exchange the dignity of his present position for the rough and tumble of election to another place. But I do see one noble friend of mine who I believe would be ready to undergo this trouble. I remember my noble friend Lord Londonderry once expressing in my hearing a wish that he might die a Member of the House of Commons. I hope he will not be offended if I describe him as one of the middle-aged caged eagles. But my noble friend is a qualified —doubly qualified—Peer under the Bill, and he is precisely the kind of Peer I am anxious to retain in this House. Speaking from my own point of view—and I have had experience of both Houses, having sat for a number of years in the House of Commons—I can candidly and truthfully say that I have never experienced the slightest desire to return to that Assembly, and I believe this to be a feeling which largely prevails here. My opinion is that for a person of an active disposition there is rather more to be done here, either in a beneficent or an unbeneficent sense, than there is in another place. In any case, the principle of the Bill is that all Peers of experience should be retained, if possible, in this Assembly.

Now I pass from the Temporal to the Spiritual Peers, who are dealt with under Clause 4. Having asked the Temporal Peers to accept a reduction in their numbers, on the principle of equality of sacrifice the Lords Spiritual may also, I think, be invited to accept the same reduction. It will be observed by those who have read the Bill that not only will every right rev. Prelate in this House have a voice in deciding upon his representatives, but all those Bishops who are not in this House will also vote, and they will be entitled to minority representation like Temporal Peers. And may I here express the hope that the right rev. Prelate who appears always to represent the permanent Opposition on the Episcopal Benches will find a seat in the new and reconstituted Assembly?

With regard to life Peers, the late Lord Salisbury said, as long ago as 1869—

> "We belong too much to one class, and the consequence is that with respect to a number of questions we are too much of one mind."

That, I think, puts the case in the proverbial nutshell. The proposals in this Bill follow almost exactly the lines of Lord Salisbury's Bill, but with this difference, that Lord Salisbury in his measure laid down categories of life Peers. They were to be selected from judges, admirals, generals, ambassadors—the usual sort of person we are all acquainted with; but objection was taken to this proposal on several grounds. One ground was that many of these distinguished persons would be too old to be of much use when they came here; but I take it that the real difficulty and the real objection to what I may term categorical life Peers is that if you are going to lay down categories or various classes who are to be represented you at once open the door to the difficulty of the great unrepresented. Take, for instance, the case of Nonconformists. It has been constantly urged that Nonconformists should be represented in this House. But I wonder if many people realise that there are something like 250 different denominations in this country. If you select one of the principal Nonconformist denominations, why should not, for instance, the Salvation Army claim representation? And if you are going to lay down a regulation that there are to be representatives of arts, sciences, and so forth, you at once open the door for an agitation for representation of the drama; in fact, it would not surprise me if the claims of those two great communities represented by "the muddied oaf and flannelled fool" were seriously urged in many quarters as worthy of representation. It is far more practical to leave the decision of who are to be life peers to the Government of the day. The responsibility must attach to the Government, and for my part I should never have any fear that any Government would appoint improper persons.

There is only one other point to which I need draw attention. I refer to Clause 7, which enables Peers who are not returned as representative Peers to stand for the House of Commons. This is an alternative which has been constantly urged, and everybody I think has seen the unjust position in which the unrepresentative Scottish Peers are placed. The unrepresentative Scottish Peer is a sort of political derelict. He is classed with paupers, lunatics, criminals and those persons who are not allowed representation at all, and his position is manifestly unfair and unjust. I am told that the proposal which I make in this Bill is unjust too, because it is stipulated that a Peer who decides to stand for the House of Commons must so decide definitely and once for all. This may appear somewhat harsh, but at the same time, being of an essentially fair disposition myself, I was very unwilling to appear to place Peers in an advantageous position as compared with anybody else, and it seemed to me that it would be resented as distinctly unfair if a Peer were allowed to sit in the House of Commons and then when he had had enough of it retire to this House. In the only case of hardship which I can think of—namely, that of a young Peer who rose to distinction, accepted office, and so forth—the difficulty could well be met by bestowing a new peerage upon him. Qualified Peers would not be allowed to stand for the House of Commons. I frankly admit once more that I am extremely anxious to keep all the best men, if possible, here, and I do not entertain much fear that the attractions of entering the House of Commons will overmaster all these possible candidates; because though, no doubt, considerable pressure might be put upon a young and active Peer to stand for a constituency, yet, on the other hand, considerable pressure would doubtless be placed upon him in the opposite direction.

I have gone through the Bill, and if I have not been so lengthy and explicit as the importance of the occasion might seem to warrant it has been because I have no desire to weary the House with well-worn arguments, and I think it just as well to spare you all unnecessary and obvious moralisings on the subject of reform. I will merely very respectfully urge upon the House the advisability of giving this Bill a Second Reading, and of referring it, together with any other proposals that may be brought forward, to a Committee as is proposed in the Amendment standing in the name of my noble friend Lord Heneage. There is another Amendment on the Paper which I am hardly prepared to discuss or to treat in a serious spirit, namely, the Amendment which is put forward by the Government. That Amendment merely amounts to a blank and a barefaced refusal to deal with questions which noble Lords opposite have been asserting for many years ought to be dealt with as soon as possible. The course proposed by my noble friend Lord Heneage is preferable to that proposed by the noble Earl Lord Cawdor, although I recognise that his is not intended in a hostile sense. On previous occasions I have noticed that when anybody moved for a Committee he was told that he ought to put his ideas into the shape of a Bill, and that a Committee, if it had to consider a Bill, at all events had some definite subject to investigate. If the proposal on the Paper in the name of Lord Cawdor is adopted I am afraid it may not result in anything very definite being decided upon for a considerable time to come.

All I have to say in conclusion is this. Those who have paid me the compliment of following what I have said have noticed that I have carefully abstained from touching upon those differences which unfortunately prevail at the present moment, or did prevail a short time ago, between the two Houses. I have purposely avoided that subject, because it seems to me that the composition of this House and the relations between this House and the other House are separate questions, and I see no reason myself why they should be treated in any Party spirit. If I may sum up what I have said, I would like to point out that this Bill proposes absolutely no increase either in the powers or in the privileges of this House. It leaves those powers and privileges exactly as they are. All that it does is to propose that they should be exercised only by those who have shown evidence of their capacity and inclination for public life, or who have been honoured by their fellow Peers with the duty of representing them in Parliament, and whilst I harbour absolutely no illusions with regard to the merit of this scheme, or as to my own incapacity to discharge this task in a satisfactory manner, yet I confess that I do entertain a faint hope that this Bill may possibly contain a basis of settlement which may eventually commend itself to moderate men of both Parties.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2a."—(*Lord Newton.*)

EARL CAWDOR rose to move, "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the suggestions which have from time to time been made for increasing the efficiency of the House of Lords in matters affecting legislation, and to report as to the desirability of adopting them either in their original or in some modified form."

The noble Earl said: My Lords, I am sure that no one who has listened to the noble Lord will for a moment have the feeling that it was unwise or improper that he should have introduced this subject, but the method by which the noble Lord has brought it before your Lordships—namely, in the shape of a Bill—may be open to criticism. One is very much tempted, in dealing with this question, to harp perhaps too much upon the many attacks that have been made upon your Lordships' House and the many harsh and unjust things that have been said of it. But I venture to submit that we have not so much to consider these statements and attacks, which have been made by both irresponsible and responsible statesmen, and what I may almost call the petulant denunciation of Ministers against this House because we are not always able to accept their legislative proposals—we have to consider the position of this House in the Constitution of this great country. We have to consider our responsibilities to our fellow citizens and to the Crown. I suggest to your Lordships that in dealing with any question relating to the reform of this House we must proceed with the utmost caution, and we should be most careful that any measure we adopt is a measure not of destruction but of reform.

The noble Lord who has just sat down has asked your Lordships to read his Bill a second time. I am aware, of course, that if that step were taken it would be possible very largely to modify the provisions of the Bill in Committee. I may be told that if we read this Bill a second time we shall do no more than simply affirm the principle that some reform of your Lordships' House is necessary. I am not able to accept that view. I cannot believe that your Lordships could properly accept the Second Reading of this Bill and not feel yourselves bound at all events by its main provisions. You cannot divorce a Bill of this kind from its prominent contents. I ask your Lordships to consider some of them. In the forefront of the Bill there is the provision for what the noble Lord describes as the discontinuance of writs of summons. No writ, after the passing of this Bill, would be issued to a temporal Peer unless he were a representative or a qualified hereditary Peer within the meaning of this Bill, and no writ would be issued to any spiritual Peer unless he were a representative Lord spiritual within the meaning of the Bill. Under this provision three-fourths of the hereditary temporal Peers, other than those who are qualified hereditary Peers, would disappear, unless they were qualified under the first schedule of the Bill; and under Clause 4 three-fourths of the spiritual Peers would disappear altogether.

Under Clause 6, which my noble friend seems to think quite a small part of his Bill, the Act of Union with Scotland, and the Union with Ireland Act as to representation in your Lordships' House would cease to have effect. It appears to me to be rather a strong measure to deal with a matter of that kind in one clause of this Bill. As to whether these sweeping proposals are or are not in the right direction, I am not at the moment going to express an opinion. But surely they are very wide and far-reaching changes which strike very deep into the constitution of this House; and they require very close examination before it is possible to give a Second Reading to this Bill. We are sometimes told that we are not a representative body. I deny entirely the truth of that statement. The noble Earl opposite smiles. I deny it again; the noble Earl must use some more convincing argument than that. There are, I submit, many interests and individuals represented in this House who, but for your Lordships' House, would have no representation in the government of the country. Under the noble Lord's Bill, such distinguished men as Lord Kelvin and Lord Lister——

LORD NEWTON: They are created Peers.

EARL CAWDOR: I am aware of that. I am speaking of Peers who are in the House at present, but who might not be in the House under the noble Lord's Bill. Under the Bill neither of those noble Lords nor many others equally distinguished would find a place in your Lordships' House unless they chanced to be elected representative Peers.

LORD NEWTON: All created Peers are qualified Peers. The two noble Lords mentioned are created Peers.

EARL CAWDOR: The noble Lord will have an opportunity of explaining his Bill further if he desires to do so. I suggest that there are no means in this Bill by which in the future Peers of this high character would be secured a place in your Lordships' House.

LORD NEWTON: You are quite wrong.

EARL CAWDOR: I am not suggesting that the noble Lords would be removed from the House; I am suggesting that in future noble Lords of that high character might not, and probably would not, find a place in your Lordships' House. When Parliament began there would be an election of Peers in your Lordships' House. Is it so certain that Peers of that class would pass through that ordeal and would be elected? We should all agree that they should be elected, but does any one believe that an election such as that would not take place under Party conditions? Is it not a perfect certainty that there would be a rush to secure at the outset a certain number of Party adherents; and, if that be so, Parties would be driven to seek for those upon whom they could rely for Party support and for regular attendance; and it is very likely, indeed, that men of distinction of the class to which I have referred would be squeezed out owing to the exigencies of Party warfare.

It seems to me that, under the provisions of the Bill relating to qualified hereditary Peers, those Peers who succeeded to their peerages in early life would to a large extent disappear. Let me take two examples. The noble Marquess who leads the Opposition und the noble Earl on the Cross Benches, Lord Rosebery, both succeeded to their peerages at a very early age. Neither of them would have been qualified representative Peers under this Bill. They might have been elected, but they might not; and I suggest to your Lordships that under this Bill untried men are clearly not intended to be elected representative Peers. Both those noble Lords, as soon as they had taken their seats in this House, showed very clearly the metal of which they were made; they made their mark in your Lordships' House from the first, and they have made their mark upon the annals of their country. But under the noble Lord's Bill they would have had no place in this House.

The LORD PRIVY SEAL (The Marquess of Ripon): That does not apply to Lord Rosebery.

Earl CAWDOR: Why not?

The Marquess of RIPON: He is a Scottish Peer.

Earl CAWDOR: The noble Marquess may be right. If so I had overlooked that fact; but assuming that the noble Earl is an English Peer, as I thought he was, in that case my point is correct. Both of those noble Lords might, and possibly they would, have taken refuge in another place. But, if they had done so, this House would not have known them, for Clause 7, sub-section 2, provides that—

> "No hereditary Peer who, after succeeding to his peerage, has with his consent been nominated as a candidate for election to the House of Commons shall be capable of being elected a representative hereditary Peer under this Act or of sitting in the House of Lords as a qualified hereditary Peer."

I think that is a very serious position considered as affecting those Peers, whatever their ability may be, who succeed to your Lordships' House at a very early age. There is, however, a qualification by which any one who has been elected to serve in the House of Commons on not less than two occasions before succeeding to his peerage becomes qualified as an hereditary Peer. But this qualification would have been of no avail in the case of either of the two noble Lords I have mentioned. Neither the noble Marquess nor the noble Earl would have been qualified under those terms; but I do find that the effect of this qualification—the reason for which I sought at first in vain—is that the services of the noble Lord who has introduced this Bill would have been saved to your Lordships' House.

Lord NEWTON: I was returned three times.

Earl CAWDOR: Then the noble Lord was more than qualified. No one doubts the noble Lord's ability, and his fitness for the peerage, and there is no one whom we would miss more from the debates in your Lordships' House, which he does so much to enliven and to brighten. But I ask your Lordships to look at the contradictions on this point. In the one instance, election twice to the House of Commons, irrespective of what service may be done in the House, is to be a qualification for membership of your Lordships' House; but, on the other hand, if a Peer desiring to show his ability for work, his capacity for office, and his fitness for your Lordships' House, passes into the other House in the meantime, he is for ever debarred by Statute from taking his seat in your Lordships' House. That surely is a contradiction which is rather a flagrant one, and which again points to the desirability of not passing this Bill hastily even as far as the Second Reading. We have in this House under the nomination of the Crown many men of the highest worldwide reputation. Under the qualifications laid down in this Bill it would be very difficult to secure their services, and in the future, so far as I can gather, there would be no means by which their services could be secured to the Crown unless they were merely appointed as life Peers.

We are told sometimes that this House should, Parliament by Parliament, and year by year, be made more the reflex of another place, that the evil of this House is that it does not change with the fluctuations of another place. I trust that that view will not hastily be taken by your Lordships, for if anything were done which would tend to ensure the same fluctuations of opinion in your Lordships' House as occur in another place that stability which is of its essence would absolutely disappear. We may be told that there is much to be said in respect of the past action of your Lordships' House in regard to various Bills. Our action last session may be criticised. I do not think we need be afraid of being able to justify that action; nor do I think we need have the slightest fear of what the verdict of history will be as to the course taken by the majority of your Lordships' House. I would remind noble Lords of that memorable case some years back when your Lordships reversed the decision of the other House with regard to the great question of Home Rule. By that action your Lordships' House saved this country from the grave disaster of having carried into effect a measure contrary to the wish of the nation and in defiance of their voice. It is, perhaps, worth noting the extreme care that was taken during the last election by those who are now in office to keep away from the minds of the electors any decision upon that vital question.

I said at the outset of my observations that there are many charges made against your Lordships' House. There are many ignorant, bitter partisans whose utterances we may treat with the contempt which they deserve. But I confess to having read with grave concern some observations made by the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council some months ago, when he used these words—

> "Though Englishmen were not greatly affected by anomalies, they were greatly affected by fair play, and when people sat down to a game they did not like to see one party play with marked cards and loaded dice."

And then the noble Earl went on to say that when he spoke of marked cards and loaded dice he meant that they did not get fair play for both sides in the House of Lords. Without commenting further upon these remarks, I confess my astonishment that the noble Earl, usually a model of courtesy in your Lordships' House to all his opponents, should have used such words—words which he would resent himself most bitterly if applied to him; and never from that time to this has the noble Earl said anything to diminish the venom of those words or their injustice to his opponents in this House.

I ask your Lordships, then, not to accord a Second Reading to this Bill. I suggest, on the other hand, that it would would be wise to inquire by Committee into any suggestions—including, of course, the suggestions made by the noble Lord's Bill, and the Bill itself—that have been made from time to time for the reform of your Lordships' House. The noble Marquess who leads the House has told us that he is in favour of a Second Chamber, but he is also in favour of the reform of that Second Chamber, If so, may I suggest that the noble Marquess is in favour of a strengthened Second Chamber, for, if not, he must be in favour of a weakened one.

The Marquess of RIPON: I have not said anything of the kind.

Earl CAWDOR: I will read from *Hansard* the exact words of the noble Marquess. At the opening of this session the noble Marquess said in this House—

> "What I do say is this, this House does require reform. You do not deny it, you have declared it to-night, and . . you are ready to consider proposals for its reform. My noble friend Lord Newton, I understand, intends to raise that question. [Lord Newton: Yes.] Then I reserve anything I may have to say upon it until my noble friend brings forward his proposal."

I think I am justified, after those words, in saying that the noble Marquess is strongly in favour of reform. The noble Marquess now leaves us in this position, that the Government are in favour of a Second Chamber, and in favour of its being reformed, but that they have not made up their minds whether they wish to strengthen it or to weaken it. We shall listen with interest to what the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council will say to us to-night; but I had thought, after the statement to which I have referred, that

I would have been able to claim the noble Marquess's vote to-night until I saw a day or two ago the Amendment on the Paper in the name of the noble Earl.

If this House is to continue as a Second Chamber, amend it if you will, reform, improve, and strengthen it if you can; but do it temperately and after due inquiry. I beg your Lordships not to cast away the much that you have that is of value to the State for the shadowy possibility of what you may put in its place. Before I sit down may I quote a few words of one of the greatest Leaders of your Lordships' House—the late Lord Salisbury? Lord Salisbury introduced into this House two Bills mentioned by the noble Lord in his speech in moving the Second Reading of this Bill to-night—the Life Peers Bill and the Discontinuance of Writs Bill. Describing those two Bills the noble Marquess said—

> "They are simply designed for the purpose of strengthening the House of Lords, giving it a power of removing that which is objectionable and of adding to itself that which is powerful and strong, and of doing its duty better before the country. These Bills are not designed for the purpose of introducing any new principle into the Constitution, or of heralding any revolutionary changes in a body which has lasted so long and has done so much service to the State."

In moving the Amendment which stands in my name I would venture to commend those thoughtful and weighty words to the earnest attention of your Lordships.

Amendment moved—

> "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider the suggestions which have from time to time been made for increasing the efficiency of the House of Lords in matters affecting legislation, and to report as to the desirability of adopting them either in their original or in some modified form."—(*Earl Cawdor.*)

*THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (The Earl of CREWE), who had the following Amendment on the Paper—

> "To move, as an Amendment to Earl Cawdor's Amendment, to leave out all the words after 'That' and to insert the words 'in the opinion of this House it is not expedient to proceed with the discussion of various proposals for reforming the constitution of this House until provision has been made for an effective method of settling differences which may arise between this House and the other House of Parliament,"

said: My Lords, the House may have observed that I have placed an Amendment on the Paper following that which has been moved by the noble Lord who has just sat down. Under ordinary circumstances it would not be usual to discuss that Amendment until a decision had been reached as between the noble Earl and the noble Lord who moved the Second Reading of this Bill. But I think it will be to the general convenience if we have only one debate instead of two, and therefore I venture to intervene at this moment, and to say what I have to say. The fact is that the reasons which actuate us in not supporting either the Second Reading of the Bill or the Amendment of the noble Earl are precisely the same reasons as those which induced us to put down this Amendment. Consequently when the time comes when I can move it I shall not have to trouble your Lordships, I hope, with any further remarks.

The noble Lord who asked your Lordships to read this Bill a second time said with great truth that this is no new subject. Your Lordships have often devoted your attention and energies to the task of reforming yourselves. So long ago as the year 1719 an attempt was made to reform the House in a singular way by limiting it to the Peers—then 178 in number—who sat in the House, only permitting the Crown to create six more. That was done partly to resist the influence of the Crown in the creation of Peers, partly to consolidate, no doubt, the power of the then ruling families.

Again in 1780 the then Duke of Richmond, who was a very much more advanced politician than my noble friend who now enjoys that title, introduced a measure which, though nominally a Reform Bill, proposing to introduce manhood suffrage and equal electoral districts, also would have largely affected the powers of your Lordships' House by proposing the institution of annual Parliaments. Those are all old stories, and the two noble Lords who have already spoken have dealt with more recent attempts which have been made by my noble friend on the Cross Benches and by Lord Dunraven and others to reform your Lordships' House. They have not, I think, mentioned the remarkable debate that took place in, I think, the year 1856 on the question of the power of the Crown to create life Peers; nor have they alluded to the fact that in 1876 life Peers were added to your Lordships' House in the persons of the Lords of Appeal, and to the further fact that in 1887 their possession of a seat with full privileges of this House was not confined to the period during which they exercised their judicial functions.

I think I need not say anything of the various important and complicated proposals which produced some of the most interesting debates that have arisen within recent years, at all events in your Lordships' House, which distinguished the years 1888 and 1889. The Bill of the noble Lord is avowedly founded on some of those suggestions. But I am bound to say there are to me two reasons why, in spite of the incisive manner in which he introduced the subject in a speech which had all the qualities of vivid description and dry humour which we are accustomed to associate with his appearances in this House, I could not help feeling that he might almost be dealing with the revision of the Constitution in some shadowy land of the imagination, some Barataria, or Crim Tartary, rather than with an existing Chamber in this country. There are two reasons why this debate seems to me to be unreal. The first is that the late Government, during its ten years of unchallenged supremacy, did not make the slightest effort to deal with this question. All the circumstances were absolutely favourable; but, as a matter of fact, except for that rather strange measure of 1893, known as "The Eldest Son's Protest," called, I think, the Removal of Disabilities Bill, no attempt has been made on that side of the House, and none whatever by the Conservative Government, to introduce any kind of reform of your Lordships' House. We may hear, later on in the debate, some explanation of that fact.

But what far more than this makes this debate seem to me somewhat unreal is the fact that everybody knows that the question which interests the country at this moment is not the reform of your Lordships' House, useful or important though that may be, but the question of the respective powers of, the relations that exist between, the two Houses of Parliament. Consequently, I do not propose this evening to discuss in any detail whatever the proposals of Lord Newton. I will merely say this in passing, that I should be very sorry if any measure introduced by me were subjected to such scathing and, to my mind, damaging and unanswerable criticism as that which has been levelled against some of its provisions by the noble Earl who has just sat down.

I pass to the Amendment of the noble Earl, which, I think, without any extravagant flight of fancy, I may venture to assume is the one which your Lordships' House will think fit to adopt. The noble Earl desires that a Committee should be appointed to consider the suggestions which have from time to time been made for increasing the efficiency of the House of Lords in matters affecting legislation. It seems to me a somewhat singular circumstance that a suggestion of, at any rate, a qualified inefficiency of your Lordships' House should come from the benches opposite. I am very glad that the suggestion that your Lordships are not as efficient as you might be has not come from this side of the House. So many charges are brought against us that I am glad to think that we are, at any rate, free in this matter. We have not suggested, and we not now suggest, that your Lordships' House is in any degree inefficient. What ground is there for making that charge? I looked up the word "efficient" in that storehouse of universal knowledge, the Oxford Dictionary, and I find under it, "Efficient—productive of effects"—nobody can say that your Lordships' House is not productive of effects; "adequately operative"—some of us think almost too adequately operative; "of persons, adequately skilled"—I should be very sorry indeed to suggest that the Members of your Lordships' House are anything but adequately skilled.

The noble Lord spoke of the private business of the House. I think there is general agreement that private business, one of the subjects which, I imagine, might fall under the notice of the noble Earl's Committee, though not conducted, I dare say, by as many noble Lords as might be desirable, is conducted, as I believe, with the highest degree of efficiency. And as regards the public business of the House, whatever charge may be brought against your Lordships, either in this House or on platforms or elsewhere outside, I for one shall never support a charge of anything approaching inefficiency against the conduct of business in your Lordships' House.

There is another interesting fact to be noticed in connection with the noble Earl's Amendment. No proposals are to be considered by this Committee except what may be called the voices of the past. No new suggestion, apparently, of any kind for the improvement of your Lordships' House can come before this Committee. A black line is drawn at a point beyond the Bill of the noble Lord which, I suppose, would come before the Committee, and, further than that, no suggestion can be entertained.

EARL CAWDOR: Will the noble Earl read the end of my Amendment?

> "And to report as to the desirability of adopting them either in their original or in some modified form."

*THE EARL OF CREWE: Yes, but it is a modified form of the same suggestion.

EARL CAWDOR: It may be modified to any extent.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: But i tdoes not seem to me to include a new suggestion. That may be all very well, but I maintain, and the Government maintains, that the real, the urgent, question in relation to this House is not its efficiency, but its Party character. It is not the hereditary character of the House. It is not its, possibly, undue size, but it is the perpetual and overwhelming preponderance of one single Party in the State in your Lordships' House. This House is a Conservative House. On February 28th last, in reply to a Question put to me by my noble friend Lord Camperdown, in regard to the introduction of more Bills into your Lordships' House, I pointed out that it was very probable that time would not necessarily be saved by the introduction of Government Bills, because your Lordships would be likely to alter their shape to a great extent, and that, if they were altered again in the House of Commons, the whole process would take as long as if the Bills were originally introduced in another place and then brought up here. In reply to that the noble Marquess opposite, the Marquess of Lansdowne, said—

> "I object altogether to the assumption that this House is not to be trusted to discuss in an impartial spirit any measure which the Government of the day may desire to bring forward."

The noble Marquess, as becomes one who has presided over the Foreign Office, is singularly careful in his choice of words, but, on this occasion, I think it must be admitted that he used an epithet for which no warrant can be brought forward. It is inconceivable to me that the word "impartial" can be applied with any degree of propriety to the action of your Lordships' House. We do not ask for it. We do not expect impartial, judicial consideration for our Party Bills in this House, and we certainly attach no blame to noble Lords opposite if they do not give it. They are themselves among the brightest luminaries of one great Party in the State, and to imagine that, when our measures are brought here, they can regard them otherwise than as Party men is surely to suggest a character for your Lordships' House which, so far as I know, is not claimed; and, if it were claimed, I confess I cannot conceive that that claim could be maintained. There is nothing to be ashamed of in that. Under our Party system, as we know very well, the highest patriotism is involved in the belief that the triumph of a man's own Party is the best thing for the country; and it is far from my mind, therefore, to suggest the slightest imputation on noble Lords because, being Party men, they act as Party men when they come to this House.

We sometimes hear of the independence of this House, and I am not sure that the phrase was not used by the noble Earl who spoke last. I am bound to say, with some experience of this House, that if by independence is meant independence of Party, it is, in the case of the vast majority of the Members of this House, a complete myth. How often have your Lordships, as a House, shown yourselves independent of Party? I will take the last twenty years. I can only recall three occasions upon which the Conservative Leader of the House was not supported in his action, and one of these was hardly a case at all. It was the case of the appointment of the Chairman of Committees in 1889. Two noble Lords, both most admirably qualified, were brought forward. Lord Salisbury's opinion of the claims of one was not the same as the opinion of the majority, who thought the claims of the other noble Lord stronger, and in that case Lord Salisbury was not followed.

The second case, in the same year, was more serious. It was the case of the Land Transfer Bill. There were certain clauses in that Bill which dealt with succession to landed property in cases of intestacy and otherwise. Some noble Lords objected to those clauses, which they thought trenched on the custom of primogeniture, and, when the matter was put to the vote, Lord Salisbury was defeated, and he withdrew the Bill. But, in that case, it simply meant that the House was more Conservative than the Conservative Leader and the Conservative Lord Chancellor. The only other instance was that, in 1896, of the Irish Land Bill, which was known among Irish landlords as the "Save us from our friends' Bill." On that occasion the Government was defeated several times on clauses in Committee, but, as a matter of fact, the clauses were reinserted in another place, and I think the Irish landlords ultimately accepted them. Those are the only three occasions I can recall when the House can be said to have shown independence. If there are others I am inclined to think, at any rate, that the total number can be counted on the fingers of one hand.

It is not too much to say that at this moment your Lordships' House is the Opposition. Suppose the noble Marquess opposite and his friends on the Front Bench were displaced by Mr. Balfour, Mr. Long, Mr. Wyndham, and other Members from the Opposition Benches in the House of Commons, we should deeply regret the loss of the agreeable society of the noble Lords; but, from a political point of view, it would make no difference in the world. Suppose Sir Alexander Acland-Hood were to take the place of my noble friend Lord Waldegrave, the only difference would be that your Lordships might receive the usual summons for attendance on particular occasions couched in somewhat more vivid and picturesque language than I imagine is employed by the noble Earl. There are, I think, 158 Conservative and Liberal-Unionist Members in the House of Commons, and if those Gentlemen were brought here and an equal number of your Lordships removed elsewhere, again we should have to regret great personal loss, but the conduct of business and the fate of Bills in this House would be precisely as now.

What is the position of the Government and those who oppose them in relation to the conduct of affairs? I recall the communications that passed between some of my friends, myself, and some noble Lords opposite and their friends during the last days of our discussion upon the Education Bill last year, and I can only say that our position was comparable to that of the French statesmen who in February, 1871, at the close of the Resistance of Paris, went out to Versailles to interview Prince Bismarck. In the case of the Siege of Paris, if I remember rightly, certain proposals were made and the French plenipotentiaries were told that unless they were agreed to in a certain time the guns would again open on the city. In our case we were not able to assent to the terms proposed, and the bombardment took place. This is not a question of the *amour propre* of any set of Ministers, for that is a matter of no importance whatever. I need hardly say that the communications were conducted throughout with a consideration and courtesy that would have prevented the most thin-skinned politician from entertaining any suspicion of offence, but the point is that we who represent the Government of the day are on such occasions relegated to a subordinate position.

Now I think the noble Earl somewhat played with the word "representatives," for as generally used in political parlance it means and can only mean those who are appointed to political positions through the process of popular election. Lord Salisbury in 1888 argued that, after all, a Conservative predominance need not necessarily be permanent. He had, I think, to go back to the days of Lord Palmerston and the then Lord Derby to find instances in support of his contention. But Lord Salisbury spoke nearly twenty years ago, and I am certain now that no noble Lord will rise in his place and say that he anticipates anything but a permanent Conservative majority in your Lordships' House.

The noble Earl who spoke last said that a second Chamber must necessarily be of a Conservative type, and I do not quarrel with the statement, though I do not go the whole length with the noble Earl in his instances. It is reasonable to say that, however you constitute a second Chamber, it is likely that it will be more Conservative in character than an elected House; that but is a very different thing from saying that the Conservatism of the House, as it stands, is a desirable or possible thing to maintain in a constitutional country and in the present state of political opinion.

EARL CAWDOR: I do not think I said that the House must necessarily be Conservative. I said it should not fluctuate in opinion in the same way as the other House, and that its stability was of its essence.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I think the noble Earl mentioned instances to show that persons created Peers would——

A NOBLE LORD: That was Lord Newton.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I apologise. It was my mistake. We are told it is necessary to have a Second Chamber to operate as a check upon hasty legislation; but what is the nature of this check and how is it applied? Once more let me remind your Lordships of the great alterations in the aims and methods of the Tory Party in the last fifty years. Only the other day—in February last—Mr. Balfour, at Hull, speaking of his Party, said—

> "We are not a Party who never face new things in a new manner."

Now, if one Party faces new things in a new manner without legislative check of any kind, owing to the composition of your Lordships' House, why is it necessary to have this continuous and overpowering check for the other Party when it in turn attempts to face new things in a new manner? I do not stop to deal with that puerile answer that one Party is always right, the other always wrong. But it was an argument used more in the Press by supporters of the Opposition than it is used in this House which was present to my mind on the occasion when I used that expression which has caused so much pain to the noble Earl opposite, the expression in which I used the old-fashioned comparison of the "loaded dice." Certainly I would not say anything outside that I would not be prepared to say in the House, and I therefore maintain that in this connection the comparison was justified, though I allow that noble Lords are not responsible. The constitution has loaded the dice for them; they turn up a number which is always a winning number for the Party opposite.

LORD AMPTHILL: How about marked cards?

*THE EARL OF CREWE: It does not seem to me a fair argument to say, "Oh, after all you can always advise His Majesty to dissolve Parliament, and therefore matters are equalised in that sense between the two Parties." I say nothing of the disadvantage to which a Party is necessarily put by placing the country in the inconvenient position of frequent general elections; but I should like to know what guarantee is there that a particular measure which has been rejected or modified by your Lordships will be passed in the form desired after a dissolution of Parliament? I have always found it maintained that the particular subject discussed was not that upon which the country decided. I will venture to say that, whether free trade, education, or Chinese Labour in South Africa is under discussion, it is maintained that it was upon the other subjects the elections were decided.

Now, assume that we, after our defeat on the Education Bill, had advised His Majesty to dissolve Parliament, and assume also—not a large assumption—that we were returned by a fully adequate majority on that occasion. I am perfectly certain that since last December your Lordships have been endeavouring to forget the circumstances connected with the Education Bill, and therefore I must apologise for reminding you of the three main points upon which we failed to agree. One of them had to do with the transfer of schools; another was in connexion with giving denominational teaching in certain council schools; and the third dealt with the question of giving religious instruction in transferred schools by certain teachers. Now, assuming that we were returned after a dissolution, what guarantee have we that all or any of these particular points would be decided in our favour by your Lordships' House? The most rev. Primate might urge that the return of our majority was largely due to fear of Lord Ridley and his tariff-reformers, and that it was hard that the interest of Church schools should suffer in the cause of free trade. We should have no guarantee, and therefore I say arguments are often used in this connection which are most unfair.

The question before the country rests upon the fact that the Opposition is perpetually in office. Still, noble Lords opposite might say—"All that you say of the existing House of Lords may be true; but it might not be truly applied to some renewed and regenerated House, after this Committee has sat." Our case is that any possible modification in the constitution of this House which can be made under the restrictions named in the Amendment would be subject to precisely the same criticism on account of its overwhelmingly partisan character Of course if this Committee recommended the abolition of the House of Lords and the substitution for it of an elected Senate my observation might not apply. But I assume that that will not be the case, partly because it would not come within the terms of reference to the Committee, and partly because it would also involve the abolition of the House of Commons as we now know it.

But can this Committee devise a less partisan House of Lords than this House is at present? I believe not. How are you to set about it? You may begin by getting rid of what are known as "black sheep," either by the process of direct elimination or by some process of selection which would spare their feelings and yet leave them outside. I do not know that we have ever found our black sheep —so far as they exist—a serious trouble or nuisance in this House. They are not numerous. There may be others slightly dashed with grey; but the fleeces of the vast majority of noble Lords are of the most snowy white. It is not the colour of the sheep that we object to, it is their gregarious habits. Observers of rural life will often have noticed that a flock of sheep, animated apparently by a single uncontrollable impulse, not always of a rational character, follow one of their number wherever he may choose to lead them; and it is rather in that connection than in the matter of colour that we are disposed to desire some alteration in the character of the flock.

Then, my Lords, are you going to alter the partisan character of the House by introducing a certain number of life Peers into it? There is much to be said for that course, and I certainly am not going to adduce any argument against it; but I am bound to say, so far as regards an alteration in the partisan nature of the House, it would be entirely ineffective. Are you going on the principle of having distinguished men, somewhat lumped together by Lord Newton as major-generals, rear-admirals, distinguished colonial governors, and others? You will not, I think, alter the partisan character of the House by any introduction of that kind. We have already several distinguished members of such classes in the House. Some are politicians, and some are not; and I think you will agree with me that those who are not generally exhibit their impartial character by taking little or no part in the general business of the House. Or you may try to collect a goodly fellowship of eminent butterfly hunters, landscape painters, numismatics, and sanitary engineers, and crowd your benches with such novel elements. But these people will not, as a rule, be politicians; and you will not, consequently, by an addition of that kind, seriously affect the composition of the House.

I am bound to say that if it is the desire and intention of the country that

Liberal policy and Liberal measures should be perpetually submitted, not merely to the revision, but—if they choose it—to the rejection of a Conservative Committee, I would very much sooner remain in the hands of noble Lords opposite, who are skilled, experienced, and politically minded, and who from time to time support their contentions by arguments. The belief that there exists somewhere in the country a sort of reservoir of eminent men who are not partisans and who might profitably be added to the House, and who would be able to take so distinguished a part in its deliberations that the other House and the country would bow before their decisions, is, in my judgment, a pure fallacy.

So far as I know there are only two kinds of politicians. One kind are those who have undergone what Lord Newton called the rough-and-tumble of the House of Commons by popular election. The other kind may, if you like, be divided into two classes, both of which are adequately represented in this House. The first class consists of those who, like my noble friend behind me, and the noble Marquess opposite, have been trained from their earliest years in the business of politics, and are professional politicians in the very best sense of the word. There are also those who have won admittance here by distinguished official careers, although, as I said before, they unfortunately do not take that part which their abilities entitle them to in the general business of the House. As I say, I believe that the existence of this potential addition to a new Second Chamber or to an improved House of Lords is a myth. At the time of the Bourbon restoration, as your Lordships may remember, there was a Chamber of Peers. It was a singularly distinguished body, and contained a great many of the most eminent men of the time in France. But its political influence, as history teaches, was of the most insignificant character; and I fear that a similar fate would await a Chamber constituted in this country in a similar way.

I have given the reasons why, in our judgment, if such a Committee as is proposed were appointed, it would be useless for us to take any part in its deliberations. I can assure the noble Earl and the House that we reach that conclusion from no lack of respect either to him or to noble Lords opposite. The issue before the country being what I have stated it to be, we feel that we should be utterly confusing that issue if we were to sit down at this moment and attempt to engage in a re-organisation of the constitution of the House, knowing very well that if we did so we should undoubtedly be giving colour to what I have attempted to show is the erroneous expectation or belief that something which this Committee might do might tend to modify the proposals which we will have to present in due time in regard to the relations between the two Houses.

I regret myself that these proposals have not yet been laid before the country. It is simply a question of the order of business in another place. Your Lordships will, I think, appreciate the fact that when these proposals are submitted to the other House your Lordships' friends in that House will undoubtedly ask, and ask with reason, for some days for their discussion; and noble Lords will, therefore, appreciate the fact that the precise date of the introduction of these proposals must depend upon the state of business in the House of Commons, and the progress that is made with other measures. I, therefore, regret to say that owing to that circumstance, and that circumstance alone, the Prime Minister will not, I am informed, be able to make his statement before Whitsuntide. When these proposals reach this House, I hope that they will receive not merely the serious, but the not unfriendly consideration of noble Lords opposite. They will deserve that reception at any rate, because they will not be made in a spirit of hostility to this House. On the contrary, we believe that if these proposals are adopted, there will remain a wide field of usefulness for your Lordships' House.

Nobody can have had the honour of a seat in this House for far fewer years than I have, without recognising the great qualities of many Members of your Lordships' House. We recognise, not merely what is vaguely spoken of as the ability of many Members, but their great faculty for business, their remarkable powers of work, their varied and wide experience, and the high public spirit which is conspicuous through all our Party warfare. My Lords, these things are the possession of the country and they certainly ought not to be lost to the country; but I believe that they can be employed, and will be employed, in accord with the desire of the country, in view of the changed condition of things which, to some extent, exists to-day. I believe there will remain for this House no insignificant part to play, and a part in which no Member of the House present or future, however eminent, need be ashamed to take a share. We shall be able, I hope for many years to come, by our deliberations to assist the representative House in shaping and maturing measures of many kinds which will be of benefit to all classes of His Majesty's subjects.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: My Lords, I confess that when the noble Earl who has just sat down rose to his feet I was inclined very much to regret that he was going to mix up two totally different subjects in this debate, for the relations of one House with the other have absolutely nothing to do with the organisation of this House itself. But as the noble Earl proceeded I found his speech intensely interesting, and I was, as I think your Lordship must all have been, very much touched at his kindness in assuring us that, even if His Majesty's Government carried out their proposals in regard to this House, we would still have something to do of which we need not be ashamed. But, my Lords, the noble Earl rather watered down that kind assurance by a previous utterance, for it was perfectly plain that in his opinion nothing could make this House an impartial Assembly unless it were elective from top to toe. I do not know whether that was letting the cat out of the bag, and whether that is the proposal which is going to be laid before your Lordships; but, if it is not, then any other proposition which the noble Earl lays down stands at once self-condemned by his own assertion that he cannot conceive any other constitution of this House which could make it impartial. We all know how well-read in history the noble Earl is, and I really wondered at the moment whether his memory had entirely failed him when he cited instances of the impartiality of this House. The House of Lords, with all its faults, is not a creation of yesterday. It has existed and done good work for the constitution for very many years. This dreadful blot of partiality has not, at any rate, deprived it of the power of serving the nation in the past, and I should like to know from the noble Earl or one of his colleagues what there is in the present state of the country which makes it impossible for the House of Lords to do as good service in the future. What was it that rendered this House somewhat partial of late years and unequally balanced, if such is the case? It was the Liberal Party which loaded the dice when they brought forward the Home Rule Bill. It is marvellous that the noble Earl should have forgotten the impartiality of this House on that occasion. On the spur of the moment I can mention two other instances. There was the action of this House in regard to the Compensation for Disturbances Bill.

THE EARL OF CREWE: I was speaking of cases in which the Conservative Peers had voted against their own Party.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Perhaps the noble Earl may remember that when it was proposed to give women seats on the borough councils of London, which were instituted by the late Government, the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, expressed himself strongly in favour of that proposal, which was rejected in this House.

THE EARL OF CREWE: I do not think the noble Duke will find that that was a Party division.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: Surely that is hardly a worthy answer. We are talking of the impartiality of the House. We all know that neither House of Parliament is apt to vote against its own Ministers. But that noble Lords do not exercise their impartial opinions independently of what the wishes of their leaders may be, when they have an opinion of their own, and they very often have, is, I think, an absolutely unfounded statement.

I pass now to what is really the subject of discussion to-night—namely, the Bill introduced by Lord Newton and the Amendment moved by my noble friend Earl Cawdor. I wish to support, in the strongest way I can, the general propositions embodied in Lord Newton's Bill. I do not say that I am prepared to support every sentence of the Bill; there may be some blots in it, but, if so, they are matters of detail for consideration in Committee. I was sorry to hear the attack on the Bill by the noble Earl, Lord Cawdor, who, I think, has misunderstood some of its provisions. For instance, the Bill will not exclude such men as Lord Kelvin and Lord Lister who, as created Peers, would have a seat. There is nothing in the Bill to affect the prerogative of the Crown to create Peers, and all such Peers will sit. I think my noble friend deserves the gratitude of the House for having introduced this measure. The truth of the matter is that it is not so much any failure of this House in the performance of its functions which has to be considered as changes which have affected another Chamber and the country outside.

This is a very difficult subject to speak upon. Neither House appears so undignified and to such disadvantage as when criticising the other, but I shall endeavour to avoid anything which could be called disrespectful to the other Chamber while I point out to your Lordships one or two remarkable and important facts. Before I proceed may I be allowed to say that I am not making an attack on any Party. What I am going to say would have been quite as true when the last Government were in power as it is now. The character of the Lower House has entirely changed within the last forty years. Forty years ago the independent private Member in the House of Commons was a great power. Resolutions were constantly brought forward by private Members, which, having been fully discussed, formed the basis of legislation, with the result that then we did not get such crude, ill-considered, and ill-drawn measures as are often thrown on the Table of the House. In addition, private Members were then sometimes able, without the assistance of Ministers, to pass important Bills, and we all know that there are measures on the Statute Book which go by the name of the private Members who introduced them and carried them through.

But all that is changed, and everyone knows that as a matter of fact no measure now has a chance of passing the Lower House unless the Ministry of the day give facilities for it and carry it forward. I admit that last year His Majesty's Government did help on in one way private Members' legislation by adopting the ideas and drafting of a private measure and taking the credit to themselves. But the novel and, I hope, not to be universally copied system is a bad compensation for the considered legislation of old days, carried out by private Members as well as by the Government. The Prime Minister, with a large majority at his back in the House Commons, is, so far as legislation is concerned, practically an autocrat. It is an old saying that—

> "Democracies always end with one man rule."

and that—

> "Revolutions always bring forth a Napoleon.'

In this country we carry out revolution by very slow and quiet means, but it really looks as if in one form the same result was coming about. Except for what check he may receive from his colleagues in the Cabinet, the Prime Minister has practically an autocratic rule over the legislative destinies of the country. So much is this the case that in certain circumstances he coerces the Upper House as well as the Lower. I can remember, in 1901, a Bill of 104 clauses for factory legislation was brought up from the House of Commons on August 14th, and on the 15th it was passed through all its stages and became law. I was present on the occasion. It was within the power of any one of your Lordships to have prevented that Bill from passing. It did not require any particular genius or talent; it only required a little courage. Yet there was not a Peer present who had the courage to stand up and oppose that course. I cannot help saying that that was one of the most monstrous evasions of the privileges of this House that I have ever known.

Noble Lords opposite may say that a Unionist Prime Minister could do that, but not a Liberal. But that does not alter the Constitutional question. What we want is to strengthen this House, which I affirm is the only thing at the present day which stands between the Prime Minister and the liberties of the people, because it really seems that it is within the power of the Prime Minister—a Unionist Prime Minister, if you will—to disregard the wishes of the Lower House, of this House, and of the people during his tenure of office. When a Government has lost the confidence of the country the House of Lords is the only safeguard the people have against rash legislation, and legislation which is not in accordance with their wishes. To my mind that is a real argument in favour of something being done in the direction of my noble friend's Bill.

I ask, is this such a revolutionary measure? Noble Lords speak sometimes as if the House of Lords had never reformed itself. What was the creation of life Peers when the Lords of Appeal were constituted? What was the further step when lay Lords deprived themselves of the right of voting on legal questions? What, again, was it when this House deprived itself of the right of using proxies? All these have been reforms of the House of Lords, marching with the times and the necessities of the day. My noble friend Lord Newton now says that the time has come when the House has arrived at such a size, and the business before it is so heavy and so important, that it would be a good thing to strengthen it in the eyes of the country, that some qualifications should be imposed, not before an hereditary Peer has the right to sit, but before he has an opportunity of exercising the functions which appertain to that right. That really is at the bottom of the whole matter.

If you do not approve of the particular qualifications which the noble Lord proposes in his Bill, well and good. I myself would like, I admit, to extend them. But the qualifications in the Bill are well worth considering. Your Lordships mix with all classes of men as much as your fellow-countrymen, and I would ask you if you have not as often heard the House of Lords spoken of with respect and esteem as you have heard it spoken of in any other way. During the last six or seven years there has been a strong and growing feeling throughout the country that the House of Lords is a very valuable body, and the people would be glad to see it strengthened. The noble Earl, Lord Cawdor, made an appeal to the Front Bench opposite to know whether they wanted to strengthen the House of Lords or to weaken it, but I did not hear any answer to that question. I did hear, however, that the House of Lords would be a hopeless body unless it were elective.

*The Earl of CREWE: I said nothing approaching that statement. I am afraid the noble Duke did not hear what I said.

The Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND: I believe the noble Earl said that it was hopeless to expect that this House could act impartially unless it were an elective body.

*The Earl of CREWE: No. What I said was that unless the proposition was to alter the character of the House by making it a purely elective body—which I remarked was out of the question—I did not see how it was likely to lose its partisan character.

The Duke of NORTHUMBERLAND: That is very much the same. I do not see the difference. The House of Lords must remain a partisan Assembly unless something is done which nobody suggests should be done. Therefore, is His Majesty's Government going to strengthen this partisan House or to weaken it? We must wait till the cat comes out of the bag, but in the meantime I trust that your Lordships will assent to the Amendment of Lord Cawdor referring the subject to a Committee. I earnestly hope that this reference to a Committee will not be allowed to be a shelving of the question, and that we shall not permit red herrings about the differences between the two Houses, and so forth, to divert our attention from the strengthening and reforming of this House.

I should like to say, in conclusion, that this is no new idea on the part of the noble Lord who has introduced this Bill. I have had the honour of a seat in this House for nearly twenty years, and when I first came here the air was full of reform of the House of Lords. I was extremely interested in the matter myself, but, of course, as a young Peer it would not have been seemly for me to have asked your Lordships to consider proposals for reform. But somehow or other the useful interest which was then taken in the question died out. I hope this House will now stick to the work. I I should like to appeal to my noble friend on the Cross Benches, Lord Rosebery, who has shown so much interest in the past in this question, again to take an interest in it and bring forward the suggestions which he is so well able to bring forward. I should like to see the whole intelligence of this House, which is so great, brought to bear on this question. I am confident that a wise and sound conclusion will be come to for which the country will be extremely grateful, and one which will place us under a great debt of gratitude to the noble Lord who has brought forward this Bill to-night.

*LORD BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH: My Lords, I venture to hope that the House will not think I am taking too much upon myself in intruding at this early period in the debate. I shall not detain the House at any undue length. But I think there is one thing that must be present to the minds of many of us—namely, a profound sense of disappointment with the attitude which the Government have taken up in regard to the matter, as evidenced both by the Amendment which they have placed on the Paper and by the speech of the noble Earl. The noble Earl gives as one of the reasons for not agreeing to the proposal that the Party character of this House shows such a perpetually overwhelming preponderance in favour of one of the political Parties that he cannot assent to the suggestion that it should be reformed. I venture to think that is one of the very reasons why we should endeavour to undertake the reform, to see whether we cannot do something at any rate to cure what is one of of the most constant complaints of noble Lords opposite and their supporters in regard to this House.

Then the noble Earl said that perhaps it was an accident of the situation that a Second Chamber must always be more Conservative than the other, and he was good enough to say that it was not our fault, that the dice had been loaded for us by the Constitution, and that we were, therefore, not to blame; and in the latter part of his speech he talked of us with sympathy and almost, I think, with feelings akin to love. Yet, after all that, he will not help us to cure the defects which he and his political friends from time to time in the country are certainly not backward in setting forth.

Just think for a moment of the position in which we are placed. I am not one of those who blame the noble Lord on the bench behind me for bringing forward this question. He was entirely within his rights. I think it is fortunate that he did so, and I am sure the great majority of your Lordships are glad that he has taken up the question. But I prefer, in all the circumstances, the Amendment of the noble Earl on the front Opposition Bench, and for this reason. Much as there is good, much as there is to be supported in the Bill of the noble Lord, I for one could not accept it as it stands. It was criticised somewhat hardly by the noble Earl on the front Opposition Bench on one or two points, and no doubt the Bill might be amended in regard to those matters in Committee. But my objection to giving a Second Reading to this Bill is that we might be held to be unduly committed to the particular line of action foreshadowed in it. On the other hand, if we reject the measure without any promise of consideration our action will be represented as proclaiming our belief that the constitution of this House is perfect, or that it is incapable of wise change. I do not desire to take up that attitude, and the Motion of the noble Earl on the Front Bench seems to me to provide exactly that middle course which I respectfully venture to hope the House will adopt.

I feel, as I have said, profound disappointment with the attitude which the Government have taken up in regard to this matter. What is it that they ask us to declare? They ask us to say that—

> "it is not expedient to proceed with the discussion of various proposals for reforming the constitution of this House until provision has been made for an effective method of settling differences which may arise between this House and the other House of Parliament."

If they have a method to put before the House and the country I do not see anything inconsistent with the Motion for a Committee to consider the constitution of this House. Even if their proposals were accepted, some of the defects which those of us who sit on this side of the House feel to exist regarding the constitution of the House would still remain; and it does not seem to me that, because the Government have proposals of their own to bring forward, there is any reason why we should not proceed to consider the constitution of this House, and see whether we cannot improve it.

The noble Earl was very strong on the point that in his opinion the country does not care so much about the constitution of this House as about the proposals which the Government are going to bring forward for settling differences between the two Houses. If those proposals are of such vital importance to the country, surely it would be fair to the country, to Parliament, and, above all, to your Lordships that we should see them at the earliest possible date. Various suggestions have been made, into which I shall not attempt to go. There have been some more or less veiled threats of what is described as a revolution by one of the Law Officers of the Crown, and certainly one, if not more, of the colleagues of the noble Lord opposite has gone about to various meetings and has not spoken in exactly the same tone of sympathy and friendship for this House that the noble Earl has adopted to-night.

It is difficult to know how to deal with attacks couched in the sort of language to which we have been accustomed out of doors. For my part, I feel myself in the position of one who has paid what a cabman thinks is an insufficient fare, and is assailed by a volley of abuse. You cannot answer in kind, because you are sure to be beaten, and the only thing to do is to disregard it and walk away with as much dignity as you can maintain in the circumstances. What I am afraid of is, and the fear has been greatly magnified by the speech of the noble Earl, that there is a root difference between noble Lords on that side of the House and us as to what is the real function of the House of Lords, or, indeed, of any Second Chamber in the Constitution of this or any country.

I am not entitled to speak for anyone but myself, but if I were asked to define what is the function of a Second Chamber, I should be inclined to say that its duty is to secure that no policy shall be irrevocably adopted which is not in accordance with the settled will of the people. A Second Chamber, whatever its constitution, whatever may be its powers, cannot fulfil that function efficiently unless it has some power in the last resort to compel an appeal to the country, which alone can demonstrate what is the real will of the people. It does not follow that we claim to have a dissolution upon every subject. I recognise the force of much that the noble Earl said on that point, but if the Government propose to deprive the Second Chamber of the power of making sure of the real will of the people to the extent which I have indicated, they are entering upon a course which self-respect and absolute duty will compel us to resist to the uttermost.

It may be said that the larger the majority in the representative House the greater the force with which their proposals come to us. To a great extent that may be true, but it is not the whole truth. It depends largely on the conditions under which that majority may have been obtained. It also depends very largely upon such questions as whether the majority in the other House really is a reflex of the votes of those who returned them to power. I venture to say that the difficulties of any Second Chamber in such a Constitution as ours are greatly increased from two causes. They are increased because since 1832 the House of Commons, which then became for the first time a really democratic body, has been gradually growing more and more democratic in its constitution, while this House has not been so affected. But there is a second reason why the responsibility of the Second Chamber and the difficulty of its position are greater now than ever before—namely, on account of what is perhaps inevitable in all democracies, the more strict nature and growth of Party discipline. One of the great difficulties of our position at the present time is that owing to the strictness of Party discipline we do not get the play of independence in voting in the other House which used to be the case some quarter of a century or longer ago.

To a great extent we here are between two fires. If we refuse to pass a Bill we are said to be thwarting the will of the people; if we do pass it we are told that we are too cowardly to give effect to our own opinions. I do not think that is right or fair. I for one say that there is no treason to our proper functions if we pass a Bill which we may not altogether like if we are satisfied that it is really in accordance with the settled wishes and desires of the people. But it is a very different thing when you go on to argue that the House of Commons is, as it were, a sovereign power, that it is never to be thwarted. What is the object of the change which the noble Earl opposite indicates in his Amendment? Is it to secure that the Houses are never to differ, or, if they do differ, that the elective Assembly is always to prevail? That is practically the abolition of the Second Chamber altogether.

The most hateful and insulting scheme which could be produced for the reform of any Second Chamber, and most of all a Second Chamber with a history and traditions like ours, is to keep us in name, but to abolish our powers altogether. I would sooner see this House abolished than thus reduced to impotence, and in that I am sure I speak the views of the enormous majority who sit in this House. We are trustees under the Constitution against the uncontrolled will of the elected Chamber, and that is why I deeply regret that the Government have met us with an absolute *non possumus*. I think the attitude of the Government in refusing to assist any reform, and at the same time waiting all this time before producing their own scheme, is one not worthy of themselves, not fair to Parliament, and not just in the interests of the country. I shall certainly support the Amendment of the noble Earl on the Front Opposition Bench, if he goes to a division.

LORD HENEAGE: My Lords, I wish to state my entire agreement with the speech of my noble friend the Duke of Northumberland. I will not reiterate his arguments, but will call your Lordships' attention to a curious feature of this debate. The noble Earl on the Front Opposition Bench moved his Amendment, but never said one single word in favour of it. The whole of his speech from beginning to end was a denunciation of the Bill, and I cannot understand why, if he has such a strong feeling against the Bill, he did not place an Amendment on the Paper for its rejection. Then we had the speech of the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council, who ignored the Bill altogether, and added that if the Committee moved for by Lord Cawdor were appointed the Government would have nothing to do with it. Therefore it comes to this, that if your Lordships agree to Lord Cawdor's Amendment without passing the Second Reading of the Bill, you will only set up a dummy Committee, of which noble Lords opposite would form no part whatever, and which, I think, could be satisfactory neither to your Lordships nor to the country.

It is said that if we agree to the Second Reading of Lord Newton's Bill we shall be giving our approval to everything that is contained in it. I entirely disagree with that proposition. The Bill, if it is read a second time, will be in the hands of the Select Committee to do whatever they like with. I have sat on at least two Select Committees of your Lordships' House, and I was also on a good many more in the House of Commons, but I must say I never saw two Bills so thoroughly ill-treated [as] were the two referred to the Select Committees of your Lordships' House on which I sat. Every clause in one of the Bills was altered, and in the other case we reported to the House that, while we recommended that legislation should take place on the principle of the Bill, we rejected the Bill itself. We suggested another Bill which we had seen and which had been drafted by an eminent counsel at the Parliamentary Bar.

What will be the position if you pass the Amendment of my noble friend on the Front Opposition Bench? You will simply shelve the Bill altogether. It will have no sanction from this House; it will not even have the force that would attach to an abstract Resolution of the House. The proposal on the Paper in the name of the noble Earl the Lord President of the Council appears at first sight a far more logical proposition than that of Lord Cawdor, and if Ministers had held their tongues since the King's Speech it might have been a very fair proposition for them to make; but, unfortunately, they have not done so, and, although the President of the Council told us very little in his speech of what the proposals of the Government are, still we know from the various speeches that have been made by Ministers that their sole object is to put aside the functions of this House during the remainder of the term of office of the present Government. I am quite prepared to vote for the Bill and against the Amendments of both the Front Benches.

In voting for the Bill I simply give my vote in favour of the practical reform of this House, leaving the settlement of details to a strong Select Committee. Whether the proposals put forward in this Bill are the best or not, at any rate at present they hold the field. I do not desire at this moment to detain your Lordships by reiterating arguments which you have already heard, but I should like to call attention to one of the allegations made against this House. It is that this House is not in touch with the people. I venture to say that anyone who was present, as I was, all through the education debates in this House last autumn must clearly have realised that those who took part in the debates were in very close touch with the country.

Why are we to hand over for the present Parliament the legislation of this country entirely to Ministers in the other House? Are they representatives? I think the fact that the present Parliament is not representative was clearly shown by the speeches of Lord Courtney on the Plural Voting Bill last year and on the Municipal Representation Bill this year. The noble Lord showed that if the representation of the country had been given in a proportionate manner there would have been a majority in the House of Commons of only forty on the Ministerial side. In the county in which I live 92,000 voters went to the poll at the last general election, 47,000 of whom voted in favour of Ministerial candidates and 45,000 in favour of Unionist; yet of the eleven Members returned only two are Unionists. That is the case all over the country, and therefore the present Government cannot claim that there is any particular reason why at the present moment complete power should be given to the House of Commons.

Then there is the allegation that when a Conservative Government are in office this House passes bad Bills without adequate discussion. That is a much more substantial allegation than that we do not give a fair discussion to Bills when a Liberal Government are in office. There were bad Bills passed with very little discussion during the late Government. There was the Education Act of 1902, out of which all our trouble arose, and there was the Vaccination Act passed with hardly any discussion at all. But what is the great Bill we are said to have damaged so much in its progress through this House? The Education Bill of last year. Well, if the Government believe the country is with them, let them go to the country; they will very soon find out they are wrong. I do not think there is any ground for the complaint in regard to the Education Bill. I think the Bill of Lord Newton is a good and reasonable basis on which to go to Committee, and I shall vote for the Second Reading. If that Motion is carried I shall then move the Amendment which stands in my name on the Paper, viz.—

"That the Bill be referred to a Select Committee of not less than thirty Members, with an instruction to consider the Bill, together with any other suggestions or Amendments which may be submitted to the Committee by any Member of the House, and to report as to the desirability of passing the Bill in its present or an amended form."

*LORD WILLOUGHBY DE BROKE: My Lords, when this Bill was first placed in my hands I, in common with a great many others, anxiously scanned the schedule to see whether there was the slightest probability of my being considered a fit and proper person to take any further part in the debates of your Lordships' House, and I was very much astonished to find that masters of hounds were not included in Lord Newton's list. I then turned to the reference to the House of Commons, and found to my chagrin and and disappointment that I had only been elected once, and, unlike Lord Newton, who had been elected twice, I should not be able to join him in the reconstituted House of Lords. The only other Peer besides Lord Newton whom I have heard this evening express unqualified approval of this measure, is Lord Heneage, who, by a curious coincidence, also comes within the category of those who would be able to sit in the newly-constituted House.

LORD NEWTON: Lord Heneage is a qualified Peer of the Realm.

LORD WILLOUGHBY DE BROKE: That is the point I was trying to make. Besides Lord Newton, Lord Heneage is the only Peer I have heard advocating the adoption of these proposals in full, and he happens by a coincidence to be also qualified to sit in the newly-constituted House. I will not weary your Lordships by taking the provisions of the Bill *seriatim*. They have already been dealt with by Lord Cawdor in a manner which gained my entire approval. I do not think that a more telling indictment of the measure could have been framed than that which Lord Cawdor brought forward. I, however, am one of those who almost wish that his Lordship had gone a little further and invited the House to throw out the measure forthwith, without even referring it to a Committee, though it is perhaps presumption on my part to bring forward such an opinion in the face of the expert speeches that we have heard on this matter.

I wish with your Lordships' permission to say one or two words on the witty, amusing, and clever speech in which Lord Newton moved the Second Reading of his Bill. I understood him to say that his three main objections to the House of Lords as at present constituted were based upon the sparse attendance of Peers, the undue preponderance of the hereditary element, and the predominant character of the Conservative element. I do not think that the argument of the sparse attendance in your Lordships' debates really deserves the serious attention which Lord Newton proposes to give it by this Bill. It is quite true that during the debates last autumn on many occasions only about one-half, and sometimes even less, of your Lordships' House attended; but I respectfully maintain that the attendance generally on important questions has been quite sufficient to disarm the ancient criticism which used to be levelled against this House, and which I find in the works of Mr. Walter Bagehot, who used to say that the best cure for admiring the House of Lords was to go and look at it. With regard to the preponderance of the hereditary element, I think I am well within my rights when I say that the hereditary element has stood the test of many hundred years. Although the argument of the lapse of time may savour of antiquated Toryism, I respectfully urge that it may be adduced in support of the hereditary element in the House of Lords. It may, perhaps, be urged with some force that the hereditary element tends to exclude those whose presence in this House would be of great value to our debates. It used to be said that the House of Lords closed its doors upon genius which could not found a family and upon ability which had not £5,000 a year. I do not wish to examine the bank book of any Member of your Lordships' House or his ability to found a family, but still I think that during recent years the tendency on the part of the Crown has been to include in your Lordships' House those who for any reason have shown sufficient ability or distinction to deserve the dignity of a seat in this House.

With regard to the Conservative element, to the predominance of which Lord Newton objects so much, I venture to think that that is exactly what we all, or at least a great many of us, want. If you went out of doors and said you wanted to whittle away the Conservative element in the House of Peers, I do not think you would find a very large audience to listen to and endorse your views. A Liberal House of Peers is an impossibility; it is a truism to say that it is really a contradiction in terms. I do not think the charge of our proceedings being unduly tainted with old time prejudice can possibly be levelled against a House of Lords which passed the Trade Disputes Bill and a certain clause in the Land Tenure Bill.

I venture to submit with great respect that there is nothing to be gained by adopting the drastic and complicated measure which Lord Newton has put before us. I urge with the greatest diffidence and respect in the presence of such great authorities that if you begin to interfere with the House of Lords on the scale suggested you will be tending towards a written Constitution. Our Constitution, which has grown up by degrees, and especially the hereditary element in it, is the one thing that other nations in forming Constitutions have endeavoured to copy, but without success. Further, I think the present juncture is a singularly ill-timed one for the Conservative Party to try their hand on the Constitution of the country. We have noble Lords opposite from whom nothing appears to be safe. I do not wish to make a rabid party speech, but it is admitted that they on the other side have tried their hand upon a great many questions since they came into office. Even Mr. Gilbert's comedy, "The Mikado," the wittiest and prettiest comedy in the English language, is not safe from the noble Viscount opposite.

With regard to the general issue of referring the question of the reform of the House of Lords to a Committee, it may be a great relief to Lord Cawdor to know that I for one shall not oppose that course being taken; but I cannot help thinking that it would have been much more interesting if we had waited to see what the Radical Party were going to do before saying what we would do ourselves. We have been waiting for some considerable time to hear how they were going to carry into effect the first item mentioned in the gracious Speech from the Throne at the beginning of the session. But anxious as I believe many of us are to maintain the House of Lords upon practically its present constitution, I do not think we need be afraid of referring the general question to a Committee, not because we hope that that Committee will shelve the question, but because I believe it will be exceedingly difficult for a Committee to introduce any scheme which would have any effect upon the House of Lords, or do that which the united wisdom of the Liberal Party has tried to do in vain. Although the reform of the House of Lords will probably be sent to a Committee upstairs, I hope I shall not be accused of attempting to lecture your Lordships' House if I express the wish that the question had been left in the category to which a great statesman once alluded of the things which had much better have been left alone. I beg to thank your Lordships for the very kind hearing which you have given me.

LORD AMPTHILL: My Lords, this is a question on which I cannot give a silent vote. One reason for that is that I am under a personal pledge to my noble friend Lord Newton to support his Bill, and another is that the question is one on which I feel strongly and to which I have given considerable thought. I do not say that it was clear thinking, and I have no intention whatever of inflicting the whole of the fruits of my thoughts on your Lordships. My noble friend seems to be in some need of that support which I most readily promised to give him, because he has thus far received but small encouragement and cold expressions of sympathy. Indeed the noble Earl the Lord President went so far as to say that he would be very sorry if any Bill which he had brought in had been exposed to such scathing and unanswerable criticism. But the memory of the noble Earl must be very short, for it is only a short time ago that he was actually in charge of a Bill which was exposed to scathing and unanswerable criticism—I mean the Education Bill.

The criticism to which the noble Earl referred was that which proceeded from Earl Cawdor. Personally I could see in that criticism nothing that was either scathing or unanswerable. The noble Earl found fault with several details of the Bill, but, as has been pointed out, the details of any measure can be altered without necessarily vitiating its principle or disproving its expediency or necessity. The noble Earl said that certain Peers who are among the highest ornaments of this House would be excluded if the Bill became law. I think the noble Earl was under a misapprehension when he made that statement. There are three little words in the first clause of the Bill which must have escaped his attention, for it is there stated that the provisions in regard to qualified Peers shall apply only to those entitled by descent to sit in the House. The words "entitled by descent" safeguard the position of noble Lords like Lord Avebury and Lord Kelvin to whom the noble Earl referred. Another criticism of the noble Earl was that a Peer who as a young man was elected to the House of Commons would be for ever after precluded from taking his seat in this House as a hereditary Peer. But my noble friend in introducing the Bill explained very carefully that there was an easy and obvious way of meeting that difficulty—that all that was required was to confer a new title on the noble Lord in question. As cases of that kind would not be very numerous, and as the addition of a second title would not make any serious encroachment on the general fund of such privileges of noble Lords, I cannot see that any objection could be urged against that method of meeting the difficulty.

I deplore the course of action which has been taken by the noble Earl on the Front Bench. I do not believe there is any Member of this House who can honestly say that the object of this Amendment is otherwise than dilatory. It is not as though the question of House of Lords reform was a new question. It has been a question of current politics —I might say a classical question—for over a generation, and in recent years perhaps no question has been more fully or more generally discussed. Every Member of this House who takes any part in its affairs must be fully familiar with every suggestion that has ever been made for the reform of the House of Lords, and if they were not so we have nostrums and theories of every sort and kind which writers and speakers thrust upon our attention in the daily Press. I cannot see that a Committee, however constituted, can possibly add to the general knowledge which the House already possesses on this subject. Moreover, it has been affirmed on previous occasions that the constitution of this House is too grave a matter to consign to the consideration of any Committee other than a Committee of the Whole House. Even if that were not so, I would urge the further consideration that any discussion of a question affecting the Constitution of the country should not be discussed in any other manner than *coram publico*, and that can only be done by a Committee of the Whole House.

What is the reason for this dilatory Motion? I think the noble Lord who spoke last rather indicated the feelings of those who are in favour of delay. They think that the time is inopportune —an argument which was most ably anticipated by my noble friend. Others in private discussion have gone further and said that the Bill is a confession of weakness—that it is an admission that the House of Lords needs reform. My own opinion is that the time is peculiarly opportune, in spite of the fact that the Liberal Party is in power and that the Unionist Party has not the majority to control the course of legislation. The reason I think the time is opportune, is that there is without doubt, and has been for a long time, a popular—I will not say overwhelming—but a widespread and popular demand for some alterations with regard to the House of Lords. As for the Bill being a confession of weakness, I do not think any Member of your Lordships' House would seriously contend that the House of Lords is perfect and incapable of reform. The mere fact that Members of the House of the calibre of the noble Earl who sits on the Cross Benches (the Earl of Rosebery) and the late Lord Salisbury, men who attained the highest position which any Englishman can attain, namely, that of Prime Minister—that two such Members of different ways of thinking politically should have initiated schemes of reform and pressed them upon this House is in itself sufficient proof and argument that reform is desirable and necessary. In recognising the existence of a popular demand for some reform of the House of Lords I maintain that, so far from showing weakness, we shall be proving, by no means for the first time, that we are capable of recognising, and do recognise the national will, and that we do not withstand it; we shall be displaying strength not weakness; we shall be disproving the assertion that we are incapable of moving with the times; we shall be proving that we yield to a popular mandate even though it runs counter to our own prejudices and predilections; we shall be showing emphatically that we represent the nation and not a political Party.

I have said that there is a popular mandate for the reform of the House of Lords, and that it is a mandate of long standing, and not the result of any sudden gust of popular passion or prejudice. I need not labour that point, for it has been amply shown to-night that House of Lords reform has been before this House and before the country for quite a generation past. I think, therefore, that your Lordships, whatever may be your views on the particular question before the House, must concede that there is a mandate for some reform. The question—and I admit that it is a difficult question—is what form of alteration is demanded. To ascertain that we must first of all look to the utterances of those to whom the electors of the country gave a majority at the last general election. The protagonist of the Liberal Party in this matter was the President of the Board of Trade, who, in very forcible language, advocated the abolition of the House of Lords. I will not quote his actual words; it would not be appropriate to do so in this House. Nor shall I quote the speeches of other Leaders of the Liberal Party, for nowadays it seems that nobody attaches much importance to the *ipssima verba* of any statement. No sooner is any importance attached to words which at the time of their utterance seemed full of meaning than it is explained that they have been misunderstood. We have had a conspicuous instance of that this evening. The important fact is that the opinions of the Leaders of the Liberal Party have undergone a striking change since that Party have had the responsibility of carrying on the government of the country. Before the general election they were for ending; next they were for ending or mending; still later on, after considering, as they were obliged to do, the difficulties, they inclined to mending only; and now, so far as we can judge—but of that there is no certainty—the talk among them is only of "readjusting the relations between the two Houses." But I think we may take it nevertheless that there is a mandate for some alteration in the Constitution of this House.

I next look to the gracious Speech from the Throne, and I find that this was the statement—

> "Serious questions affecting the working of our Parliamentary system have arisen from unfortunate differences between the two Houses. My Ministers have this important subject under consideration with a view to a solution of the difficulty."

I hold, and I think that my noble friend conclusively proved, that an effective readjustment of the relations between the two Houses is not possible without some internal change in this House—that is to say, such a readjustment as will not interfere with the vital principles upon which the House of Lords is founded. The Prime Minister has not yet revealed his plan, but we have had this evening a very striking and remarkable utterance from the Lord President; I might almost call it a warning—a warning which in its contemptuous terms of reassurance was almost insulting to your Lordships' House. We are to be left some work of which no Member of this House need be ashamed. That might be the work of a parish council, for I could name some of the most eminent Members of your Lordships' House who are not ashamed to take part in the work of their parish councils. But whatever meaning may be attached to the warning of the Lord President, I for one am not convinced that he foreshadowed the intentions of the Government. I think your Lordships will recognise that there may be some necessity or expediency for throwing dust in the eyes of those who are anxiously waiting to hear what actually is to be done. I prefer to think that the noble Earl was throwing dust in our eyes. Anyhow, the Prime Minister, speaking on the Address on 12th February, gave a very definite explanation of the attitude of His Majesty's Government. That attitude was one to which we can take no exception. It amounted to this—that it is proper and right for the House of Commons to take the initiative in the matter of the readjustment of the relations between the two Houses, but that it would not be right for that House to take the initiative in altering our constitution, and that is why that essentially and necessary part of any scheme of readjustment is left to this House. That the two processes should be simultaneous seems to me both appropriate and necessary. The words of the Prime Minister to which I have referred were as follows—

> "We must have such a readjustment of the relations of the two Houses as will enable us to carry out with reasonable harmony the wishes of the people. There are all sorts of schemes afloat for reconstituting the second Chamber of the Legislature—by introducing new elements, by the expurgation of evil elements, and by the alteration and revision of the terms of tenure, and so on. All such questions we set aside. What we are concerned with is that the relations between the House of Commons and the other Chamber, however composed, should be improved, and it is this to which in due time the attention of the House will be directed."

The Bill of my noble friend is designed not only to facilitate any readjustment which may be advised, but also to effect certain improvements in the Constitution of this House which have long been considered desirable and even necessary, and particularly in the direction of making this House less of a partisan Assembly. That is a point which the Lord President ignored. He maintained, but I do not think he established his argument, that my noble friend's Bill would not have the effect of making this House less partisan. May I endeavour to explain in a different way how it seems to me this Bill will have that effect? In the first place, the Bill proposes to establish a class of qualified hereditary Peers; that is to say, of Peers who owe their seats in the House to certain official qualifications. Is it not fair to expect that such Peers will feel a sense of responsibility which does not now exist and which will oblige them to look more than they do at present beyond Party to national interest, a spirit which would be something akin to that which animates the Civil Service? All who have had anything to do with public office know the admirable spirit which pervades the officials of the Civil Service. Neither by word nor by deed do they, except in the rarest instances, betray any partisan feeling, but they loyally do their best for whichever Party in the State may have the responsibility of the conduct of government. I feel strongly that the qualified hereditary Peers could not fail to be animated by something of that spirit. This in itself would minimise to a great extent the inevitable preponderance of one Party in this House.

The hereditary Peers are also to be subjected to a similar influence, for they are in effect to delegate their functions to a fourth or a certain proportion—for I imagine my noble friend does not adhere rigidly to that particular fraction—of their number. It is important to recollect that this is not really a departure from the principles which have obtained in this House for many centuries past. It would be in fact a resuscitation in a modern form—a form which is being adopted more and more by the other House—of the ancient right of voting by proxy. At the same time it is equally necessary to insist on the fact that the hereditary principle is preserved in full force, and I am glad to see that the only member of the Government who has spoken to-night did not attack or impugn the hereditary principle. Indeed the maintenance of the hereditary principle is absolutely essential unless we are to revolutionise the whole Constitution of this country and abolish as an Estate of the Realm the aristocracy who have held that position since the dawn of our history and throughout the whole period of our national progress. I am not one of those who say lightly that the hereditary principle is indefensible. On the contrary, I hold that those who make that admission are either too lazy or too cowardly to argue the question. The hereditary principle is one which obtains throughout the whole system of the universe. It holds sway in every single relation of our social life. If you condemn the hereditary principle you must *ipso facto* condemn the very principle on which the Monarchy is founded.

Those who speak on public platforms on the question of House of Lords reform invariably omit to mention how very much the hereditary principle is already qualified in this House. They omit to explain what is the vital and absolutely exceptional feature of our Constitution—that the aristocracy is not an exclusive class like the nobility of foreign nations. Our aristocracy is constantly being recruited from the ranks of democracy, thus being infused with new blood, new life, and new spirit in accordance with the spirit of the age. The total number of Members of this House is 615, of whom no fewer than 104 are Peers by creation, that is to say, the first of their title. Those who sit by hereditary right number 434, of whom only 275 are more than third in succession, a fact which disposes of the common argument or representation—misrepresentation I should rather say—that the titles in this House have been handed down from remote antiquity. Of the Peers who sit by hereditary right alone, no less than 250 have rendered public service of a kind which would ordinarily be held to render them fit for a seat either in the House of Commons or in this House. The number who have been in the House of Commons or in political office is 100, so far as I have been able to make out. In high rank in the Army or Navy, there have been 102, and we count among our Members forty-eight who have been either diplomatists or Governors of Dependencies or Colonies.

The effect of the Bill of my noble friend, so far as I can judge, would practically be to reduce the Membership of this House to those who actually do take part in its work—to those who have the opportunity, inclination, and qualifications for doing so. It would, in effect, be the strengthening of this House by a process of pruning. It would, incidentally be the means of avoiding that unedifying spectacle which has so often caused justifiable and reasonable irritation amongst members of the Party which is in a minority of this House—that is to say, a certain large influx, on some particular great occasion, of noble Lords who never take any part in the ordinary business of the House. My noble friend has pointed out that not one single member of the Party which is in a minority in this House would necessarily lose his place under the system of cumulative voting which he proposes.

I urge your Lordships to give a favourable consideration to the Bill in order that a bone of contention may be removed from the strife of Parties, and with an equally sincere desire to see fair play afforded to the Liberal Party. As an Englishman, I dislike a one-sided contest or game, and it would be a sincere satisfaction to me to see the balance of Parties more even in this House. I sympathise with those Members of the Liberal Party who are vexed with the preponderance of their opponents in this House; that is to say, I sympathise with them when their complaint is made in temperate, thoughtful, and reasonable language; but my sympathy turns to resentment when the complaint is made as some noble Lords opposite have seen fit to make it. Allusion has already been made to the notable speech of the Lord President, who was not ashamed to accuse his brother Peers of unfair dealing. There was another noble Lord who, in addressing a meeting of electors during the county council election, said that any vote given to the Moderate Party was a vote given to the House of Lords, and that no more scathing indictment could be brought against a man than that he should vote for the maintenance of the House of Lords. Another noble Lord who holds impartial sway over the Gentlemen-at-Arms, in addressing our Colonial guests the other night, said that no Colony would tolerate for a single day such an Assembly as this. I noticed that his remark met with no responsive cheer, and although I would not presume to pit my knowledge of the Colonies against his, I am certain that our fellow-citizens in the Colonies share with the majority of the people of this country a deep reverence for the past, and a great admiration for all those institutions in this country, which are due to long continued growth, and could not possibly be created by any political effort. It would seem as though these noble Lords were unacquainted with the history of their own country, and of the Assembly to which they ought to be proud to belong. Do they not know that this House has lived the life of the nation and has grown with the nation's growth? Do they not know that it has had its lot and part in everything good and great that the nation has done, and that those whom the nation from time to time have considered to be the noblest and the best have been constantly added to its membership; that it has been the means of linking the present with the past, and of reflecting, as someone has said, if not the fleeting moods, certainly the matured decisions and accomplished deeds of the nation? I do not believe the country can be stirred to hatred and contempt of a vital part of its organism by the denunciation by any body of politicians. I would remind noble Lords of a homely saying which I think would reflect the opinion of everything that is sober and temperate and reasonable in this country, namely, that it is an evil bird that fouls its own nest.

Either reform is desirable or it is not. If it is, there is no time like the present. If it is not, then let us say so boldly, instead of making a pretence of considering that with which we do not intend to proceed. In my judgment this will afford us an opportunity of vindicating for all time the claim of this House to represent the nation at large, of proving that no personal or Party prejudices will cause us to oppose that which in the due course of progress and development the nation clearly desires, and that no fear of misrepresentation, no dread of change, can deter us from acting unhesitatingly when a right opportunity suggests itself.

*LORD ROBERTSON: My Lords, I paused before rising because I felt certain that at this stage of the debate someone would rise from the benches opposite to support the Lord President in the important statement which he has made. We are given to understand that the Liberal Party is effervescing with enthusiasm and also with a still more irrepressible instinct, namely, indignation, and yet they are mute. The events of to-night are so important that the instincts of an English politician naturally lead him to express his opinion, and that firmly. I am no orator as my noble friend who has just sat down, and I propose to confine myself to two or three salient points in this most important debate. First of all, I must own—I am sure my noble friend Lord Cawdor will not take this amiss—that when I read his Amendment I could not repress a doubt as to whether it did not too much take an initiative upon this important subject. In what I am going to say now I am not at all expressing a remonstrance against my noble friend, with whom I am going to vote; but in order to appreciate the position in which we are met it is necessary to remember what is the claim of the House of Lords to influence the legislation of the country in modern times. I do not intend to inflict upon the House any historical discussion or even *resumé* of the salient instances in which this question has been canvassed. I will refer to two only which are within the memory of living men of my own age. I take the case of the Irish Church Bill of 1869, and of the Irish Home Rule Bill of 1893. It is a curious thing that that one country has supplied the two crucial instances for ascertaining the Constitution of England. In 1869, as your Lordships remember, the Houses of Parliament were fresh from a dissolution. That dissolution had been taken at the instance of Mr. Disraeli upon the plain issue whether the Irish Church should be disestablished or not. When the Irish Church Resolutions were carried in the House of Commons he announced the dissolution, and the dissolution went forward on that question. A Parliament was returned overwhelmingly in favour of the Liberal Party. They brought in their Bill, and in a memorable speech which ought never to be forgotten by politicians of the present day, Lord Salisbury laid down the relations of the House of Lords to a Parliament so elected. It is worth while remembering his words. He said that where there was a clear and well ascertained decision of the constituencies upon any one issue the House of Lords accepted their decision although it retained its own opinion. I turn to the case of 1893. Then the country had not been consulted upon the question of Home Rule, and the Bill proposed by the Government had not the sanction of any General Election decided upon it. There, although the country was agitated to its depths, and amid the threats of the Prime Minister, the House of Lords threw out the Bill and the country endorsed its action.

Allow me to ask the House this question. Are we right in discussing a subject of this kind as if we were at the beginning of things; as if we were for the first time considering the House of Lords, or as if we were doing so after a Revolution? I say that the conditions are entirely other, and I, for one, am averse to following my noble friend below me into all the details of his fine-spun schemes for representing everybody and getting every gradation of intellect reproduced in this House. I, for my part, think we had better tread the old paths. For one thing I greatly doubt the wisdom and even the constitutionality of this particular proposal. The theory under which every hereditary Peer sits here is that he has an office delegated to him by the Crown upon his personal responsibility. He must exercise it according to his own judgment and responsibility, and I find no authority in the Constitution for converting the 500 or 600 Members of this House into a constituency having power merely to elect some hundred men to act for them. I cannot help thinking that that proposal is open to the greatest objection as being constitutionally unsound and also monstrously unpopular. What would you find in the newspapers the morning after the results of the election were made known? You would find that the constituency of the House of Commons, numbering several millions of electors had gone one way, and that the other constituency, consisting of several hundreds, forsooth, had gone another. I confess to thinking that that would be invidious and justly unpopular. I go further and say it would be unconstitutional in the sense of being out of harmony with the essential and original theory of the House of Lords. But may I add this? My noble friend has exerted and exhausted his ingenuity in finding all sorts and conditions of people to put into the House of Lords. Is it certain that from a calm view of the situation, especially on an appeal to the House of Commons, that all these quick wits brought in from other pursuits are exactly the people who are best fitted to decide; would not the common people of the country say they would rather have Lord so-and-so who was sound on the bench or who was a good landlord; that they did not mind if sometimes, when he was not quite clear about a thing, he stayed away? I greatly doubt whether my noble friend's spick and span House of Lords would stand the strain of a tussle with the House of Commons as well as the present one does.

Now, my Lords, I have dwelt on this merely because I did not want to abstain from discussing what is the primary subject of this debate, and also because I admire the moderation and good humour with which Lord Newton introduced the Bill and the way in which he used the pretty wit which he knows how to apply. But I want to pass to a much more important subject. The noble Earl, the Lord President, has made a declaration to-night which I regard of the most momentous importance. He has publicly announced that this Government and, I suppose, his Party despair of finding a House of Lords which will suit his views. All the other speakers, including Lord Cawdor, have been as liberal as possible in their offers. You are in search, I suppose, of mature intellect and experience, and my noble friends have said, "Invoke the four winds of Heaven; search all the regions of science, literature, art, the Army, the Navy, anything you like; name it to our Committee, and we will see and consider it." But the Lord President of the Council will not have it, and the reason is this—because he has avowed it—that any House of Lords would be too Conservative to live with his Government. That is the real truth. Now I want to speak a little plain English on this question. As I have said, he has been offered the choice of all the various regions of intellect, and this attitude on his part is a proclamation that the Liberal policy is now so out of sympathy with any kind of trained intellect that it will not even make an experiment in that direction. I remember some years ago that Matthew Arnold, writing in one of the magazines, spoke to the politicians of both sides, and said, "If you want to succeed, make friends of the mind of the country." Well, here is a public denunciation of all attempt to do so. It is a declaration that the ways have separated—that the Liberal Party will now make no attempt to gain over those influences which would affect the mind of a body recruited from all the various branches of intellect, and that it will set it at defiance, and merely try to clip its wings. And accordingly, in the present discussion, we are entitled to assume that when Lord Cawdor has got this Committee, and when they have produced, with infinite thought and pains, a House of Lords which would represent every shade of opinion, every kind of politics, every sort of intellect—we are entitled to assume that after discussing the question with the noble Lord the Lord President of the Council he will not have it at any price, and that his position is this: "Cease all your efforts; we quite admit that any Second Chamber that you choose to rig up, will fight with us and be irreconcilable with us, and we must therefore pare down its authority and diminish its powers." As I have said, that is a most momentous declaration from a British Minister. I hope for my part that the British public will take note of it as the final separation of the two ways—the way of educated opinion, and the way of the Liberal Party—may I say further the way of good sense and the Liberal Party. I do not believe that anything of that kind will assist demagogues in the pursuit of their trade. I do not believe that the people of this country have any objection to have the best mind of the country applied to any public question, even where it may differ from their own first impression, and accordingly, as I have said, I hope the country will take note of this, and I hope the Party led by the noble Marquess on the Front Bench will take note of it that we shall never let them get away from this final declaration as to what is really the relative position of the two Parties. Any sharp conflict like this necessarily brings alarm to those who are inexperienced in the ways of politics, but I cannot help thinking that there is very small ground for alarm on the present occasion. The Government plan must have the characteristic which the noble Lord has now finally affixed to it, but it seems to have other characteristics which recede with the horizon. I am not quite sure what they will turn out to be, although I can make a guess. I say frankly that in my opinion the Government plan is predestined to failure; but I am quite certain of this, that it will not last for a day in competition with the trained wisdom of this House, if we keep our heads. The great thing is, in a controversy of this kind, to keep in the right; and I am very sure of this—and I say it with the most perfect loyalty—that with the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Lansdowne) at the head of affairs I have every confidence that that will be done. I certainly have thought this Committee was unnecessary—I have thought that the declarations of Leaders of the Conservative Party as to the position of the House of Lords had sufficed to render nugatory all the suggestions which might be made against it. But if it is thought well to thresh out these proposals and exhibit their plausibility in all their full exuberance, well, let it be so. At the same time the noble Lord opposite (the Earl of Crewe) must remember that he cannot free himself of the responsibility of allowing a subject like this to go to a Committee which is necessarily lopsided, and, therefore, if there were any suggestion, by the instigation of the Party opposite, that the Committee had hardly come up to expectation, he must bear in mind that he at least is a partner in the blame. But, my Lords, as regards the main issue, as I have said, I have a firm belief in the good sense and fairness of the English people. I do not think that faint hearts are much to the fore at the present day when this question is mentioned. I have no doubt whatever that this will act in the direction of re-instating in the minds of some who had doubted a feeling of confidence in the House of Lords, and that it will be found that no Second Chamber can be composed which will compete with it. Of this I am quite certain—that it would be a very low form of courage which would shrink from a combat with the present Prime Minister when we have defeated Mr. Gladstone. *Contempsi Catilinæ gladios; non pertimescam tuos.*

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord TWEEDMOUTH): My Lords, I think my noble friend Lord Newton has great reason to congratulate himself on the debate that he has raised this evening, and not least upon the extraordinary way in which he filled the House. At the beginning of his speech he had some little sharp remarks to make on the absence of Peers from this House, and I hope that the spur that he has given them will induce them to attend more frequently in the future. I hope also that the noble Lord himself will more often address the House, and so bring such considerable audience as he has brought down here to-day to listen to his speech and to his proposals. During this debate several allusions have been made to what are sometimes called the "black sheep," and to the views held by some of the Members of this House which are excessive and governed by Party feeling. I desire at the very outset to dissociate myself entirely from any such views whatever. I desire most cordially and most sincerely to say that I make no charge against individual Members of the House. I acknowledge that it is full of men of great capacity for public affairs, and I believe that they do their work with a desire to do what they think is right for the nation. The noble Lord (Lord Robertson) charges us with being effervescent with enthusiasm, and with a desire to interfere with this House. I do not think that that is the case. We do think that there is great need for some reform in this House; we do think that there is a necessity for such an adjustment of the relations between the two Houses as will lead to the general advantage of the nation at large. The noble Lord (Lord Robertson) instanced two cases which he thought very strong ones, namely, the action of the House of Lords with regard to the Irish Church Bill of 1869, which was carried through the House of Commons by very large majorities, and the action of the House of Lords in 1893, with regard to the Home Rule Bill of that year, which was only carried through the House of Commons by a comparatively small majority. I think that he has rather overstated his case, and that the argument which he brings forward is one that can very easily be turned against himself. I think that his argument carries with it this conclusion—that when the House of Commons by a very large majority carries a Bill, then the House of Lords, even in the past, has been in the habit of giving way to the opinion shown in the House of Commons, and of accepting such a Bill.

*LORD ROBERTSON: Perhaps the noble Marquess will allow me to say that I carefully pointed out that the text of my observation was what Lord Salisbury had said, that when the action of the House of Commons could be traced to a clear, unmistakable declaration of the country, then the House of Lords would defer to it.

LORD TWEEDMOUTH: Well, my Lords, the noble Lord makes himself sole judge of what is the view of the country. What I believe to be the best test of the opinion of the country is the majority that exists in the House of Commons. I do not think it will be denied that the House of Commons is elected by the majority of the people of the country, and that when you find a large majority one way or the other (because I will give them the full advantage of that argument on their side when they get their own big majority), then I say that this House ought to bow to the mandate of the electors, and endeavour to meet their views as much as possible. I quite agree that that argument does not hold good with regard to the Home Rule Bill of 1893. It was carried through the House—nobody knows it better than I do—by a small majority, dependent upon the Nationalist vote in the House of Commons. If the House of Lords thought it right then to recognise that that majority did not represent the views of the mass of the people of this country, I admit that they were perfectly justified in what they did, although I did not agree with them myself. But, my Lords, when in 1869 they voted for the Irish Church Bill, they did thoroughly admit that principle. As a matter of fact, the Irish Church Bill was carried on Second Reading in the House of Commons by 118, and on Third Reading by 114. The Second Reading of the Home Rule Bill was carried by forty-three in the House of Commons, and the Third Reading by thirty-four, so I am quite ready to admit that there was something to be said with regard to the action of the House of Lords on the Home Rule Bill which does not apply at all to the earlier Bill, and my argument from that would be that even in the past the House of Lords has assented to the proposition that when there was a large majority and a strong expression of opinion evident in the House of Commons, then the House of Lords should endeavour, if possible, to meet the views of the House of Commons and give way to it.

I should like just for a moment to refer to what has been the past history of the House of Lords, because I quite admit with the noble Duke, the Duke of Northumberland, that it is a very old institution—one whose existence has been entwined with the British Constitution, and which has done a great service in the past for our country. But there has been a perpetual change in the constitution of the House of Lords. What was the original position of the House of Lords? Its first origin was that it was a council of advice to the Sovereign. There were summoned to it no doubt the Peers, but the Sovereign had the right to summon, and did summon, to it the great men—anybody that he might think it desirable to summon. It was not merely the Peers that he summoned—some of the Peers he did not summon—but it was the great men, and those who he thought were his proper counsellors in matters of State. That sort of position has long ago entirely dropped away. First it became the privilege of the Privy Council, and secondly it became the work of the Cabinet, to be the counsellors of the Sovereign in matters of State. Then the House of Lords was regarded as the first Appeal Court in judicial affairs; but there again those functions are no longer performed by the House of Lords as the House of Lords. As time has gone on, the Appeal work of the House of Lords has fallen entirely into the hands of the Judges, and the lay Peers now take no part in it whatever. Then there is the further fact that the House of Lords was a branch of the Legislature—it had equal powers with the House of Commons—and there again the House of Lords has given up great rights, for it has given up all power of altering a money Bill. It keeps still the right to reject it, but that is a right which is never exercised, and so far as all questions with regard to money are concerned the House of Lords has altogether abrogated its charge of them or its power to alter them. Therefore I maintain that the position of the House of Lords itself has been gradually changed, and at this moment it is very different from what it was in the old days.

The fact of the matter is that it is only since the Reform Bill in 1832 that there have arisen the difficulties between the two Houses. Before the Reform Bill of 1832 the House of Commons was really the tool of the House of Lords, for before 1832 I find that there were no less than 306 Members of the House of Commons returned by the influence of Peers. In England there were 218 Members of Parliament returned by eighty-seven Peers; in Scotland there were forty-five Members returned by twenty-one Peers; in Ireland there were fifty-one returned by thirty-six Peers. That gave to the House of Lords a dominant influence over the House of Commons; they were able to influence them, and it was not till after the year 1832 that the House of Commons became free of your Lordships' House, and that these differences have arisen. In the words of Mr. Bagehot—

> "The House of Lords has ceased to be one of the latent directors, and has become one of the temporary rejectors and palpable alterers."

I am willing to take the view of the late Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary, Lord Salisbury. He, in speaking upon a Motion made by my noble friend Lord Rosebery, in June, 1884, said—

> "If there are any considerable reforms desired in this House and eventually carried out, I venture to say that it will not be done by previous appointment of a Select Committee; it will be done by a proposal coming from the Ministers of the Crown as in the House of Commons."

That I believe to be a thoroughly sound principle, and one to which we can all adhere. That is the policy adopted by His Majesty's Government. My noble friend the Lord President has already told you that in the House of Commons, at an early date, the Prime Minister will state what is the exact plan that he has, and which the Government have decided upon. That proposition, I think I may say, will not be aimed at the destruction of the House of Lords at all. I think that when it is put forward it will be found to be one that will maintain the rights and privileges which the House of Lords has, and at the same time be the means of adjusting the relations between the two Houses in a way that will be for the good of the whole country.

EARL OF HALSBURY: My Lords, I am afraid your Lordships have not exhibited the amount of gratitude which the announcement just made might be supposed to command. We are here engaged in a discussion of the intention to reform the House of Lords. I confess I feel some hesitation in addressing your Lordships upon the subject—partly because I fear I am not in absolute sympathy with any speech that I have heard delivered. In the first place, with the greatest respect to my noble friend Lord Newton, I do not think—much as I admire his wit—that a discussion of this sort, dealing with such subjects as it does, is quite a fit matter for jocoseness. I think that the Constitution of this country, which has lasted with advantage to the country for some centuries, is not to be lightly altered—as, it seems to me, it was sought to be altered by the observations which were made by him. Your Lordships were informed that the mode in which you were to be reformed was that three-fourths of your Members were to be deprived of the rights which you possess, and that was to be justified by the sort of observations we heard. I think that the Constitution of a country is not a matter to be treated in that—with all respects to my noble friend—somewhat frivolous fashion. It is a question which dives deep into the interests and happiness of a nation, and, for my own part, unless some particular thing was discovered which was wrong, and some particular mode of putting it right was suggested, I should have thought a discussion of this sort was peculiarly inappropriate at the present time. What is the occasion for it? Can anybody doubt that the meaning of it is that the conduct of this House during the last session is the subject which is in the minds of everybody when they hear of the reform of the House of Lords? Indeed, the noble Lord who has just spoken has given us the key to what in his view is the reason for this subject being before us. I am bound to say the noble Lord the President of the Council spoke with the frankness with which he always speaks, and he said the real thing to be remedied—that which he regards from his point of view as the great error of the House of Lords—is that it contains too many Conservatives. Is that a reason for altering the Constitution? I remember Mr. Bright once saying, when it was said that you must have minorities represented—

> "If you want to represent minorities, what you have got to do is not to take any representation for them, but to argue until you make your minority the majority."

I am not quite certain that noble Lords would take that view of this House, and that they would be content to wait until they had made their minority a majority here.

But, my Lords, what appears to me to be the serious objection to this is that every time there is a distinction between the views—I will call them so—of the other House and of this House, straightway we have got to alter the Constitution. To what extent is that to go? We have not always been in such a minority in the other House of Parliament as we are at the present moment; and would it be appropriate for us to have claimed the right to alter the Constitution because the other House of Parliament were in an enormous majority—overwhelming, I think, was the phrase used by the noble Lord the President of the Council? He said that an overwhelming majority was against us in that House. It appears to me that a principle of the sort which is implied in what the noble Lord said is inconsistent with the existence of a Second Chamber as a check at all. If there is never to be any difference between the Houses without the alteration of the Constitution of one or other House where is your check? Where have you got a check on rash and inconsiderate legislation? And has there never been rash and inconsiderate legislation? I do not know quite, speaking frankly, what the noble Lord the First Lord of the Admiralty meant by his speech. He gave us a somewhat imperfect, and if he will forgive me for saying so, a not absolutely accurate account of the early history of this House, and then something or another is supposed to follow from it, but what I have not yet ascertained, except that the Prime Minister at some date in the House of Commons—an early date, I think he said—is going to explain what he is going to do, not by way of reforming this House—at least, so I understood him—but by way of getting rid of the difficulties which exist when the two Houses differ. That is no doubt an interesting question, but it is not the question which is before your Lordships to-night; and what I want to know is, what is the particular thing which it is sought to remedy? What is the objection to the mode in which your Lordships carry on business? I have heard, indeed, of some rather exaggerated statements made in speeches on platforms to the effect that some of your Lordships do not attend, and the numbers are given of those who attend, and of those who do not. I wonder if either of the noble Lords who have made those observations have occasionally strayed into the gallery appropriated to them in the other House of Parliament during a debate, and whether they have noticed the number of Members taking part in that deliberation; because if the Members of the House are in the smoking-room, or in the refreshment room, or in other places near and about the House of Commons, I do not think it makes much difference, if they are not aiding and assisting the debates, but are engaged in other pursuits, whether they do or do not attend for the purpose of what I will call the united deliberations of the wisdom of the country.

I am also unable to follow my noble friend the Duke of Northumberland. I heard him with great interest, and with the earlier part of his speech I certainly heartily agreed. I think he pointed out with regard to that somewhat inappropriate figure of the loaded dice and the marked cards, that if the analogy were applicable at all it was one which certainly did not reflect on this side of the House. But as to the other part of his speech I am totally at a loss to understand why this House should be punished for the misconduct of the various Prime Ministers who have conducted its proceedings. The noble Duke said, with a degree of force and truth that I cannot for a moment question, that from time to time Bills are brought up into this House and forced through in this sense—that they come in the month of August, and you must take the alternative of rejecting a Bill altogether or allowing it to pass without comment. That is a most true and just criticism. But although I perhaps may be considered to be to some extent one of the guilty parties, as being partly responsible for the acts of the Government of which I was a member, the thing which puzzles me, and which the noble Duke did not explain, is why this House is to be punished for the misconduct of the Administration for the time being. It certainly is something new to say that whatever the Prime Minister for the time being does is to be visited upon this House, and because this House has not been given sufficient time and opportunity to consider the justice and propriety of a particular measure, therefore—what? The House is to be deprived of its opportunity altogether. That seems to me a most lame and impotent conclusion. What I should have thought to be the logical inference is that you ought to abolish the Prime Minister, and not that you ought to abolish the House of Lords. But there is no doubt that one of the great functions of this House is one which may be pointed to as being, as I think, of peculiar and supreme importance in these days. What happens from time to time? It is impossible not to know that from time to time Bills of the greatest importance come before the House of Commons. They are up to a certain point debated. Then comes the closure, and Bills come up to this House in which the greater part certainly—very often the most important part—has not been debated at all. And now you propose to control the power of this House, which is the only House in which free speech is permitted without the closure.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: I do not think I said anything about controlling the power of the House, did I? On the contrary, I wish to increase the power of the House.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: Then I should like very much to know what is the intention of those who recommend what they are pleased to call "reform." Is it to control and to put down the controlling power of this House—or is it to increase that power? I wish those who are desirous of reform had told us which it is they mean—because of course observations which may be very appropriate from one point of view become quite inappropriate from another. I should have thought that the power of this House to prevent rash and hasty legislation involved the power of doing that which the House of Commons—aye, and for the moment, the popular cry—would resent. I wonder whether anybody will have the courage to say which they mean? It is a little difficult to argue either that the House is to be made stronger or weaker unless you know which is the object to be attained.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: I beg the noble Lord's pardon for interrupting him, but this is a direct challenge. He asks whether we propose to increase the power of the House or to diminish it. I have no hesitation in saying—and I believe my noble friend Lord Newton means the same—that my desire is to increase the power of the House.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: To increase the power of the House, we are to take away three-fourths of it at once. That is increasing the power—to take away three-fourths of its Members. I observe the Spiritual Peers are to be diminished "in proportion," whatever that is. I remember one distinguished Liberal—Lord Granville—saying that "foolish people are desirous of diminishing the Spiritual Peers in this House," and he added, "for my own part I believe it would be a great calamity to this House if the Spiritual Peers were diminished by a single Peer." I quote from memory Lord Granville's words, but I think it will be found that I am accurate. But in what way is the power of this House to be increased? I will argue upon that hypothesis. I think the power of this House is such that with the limitations which our great statesmen have from time to time put before the House—I need not mention any other than Lord Salisbury himself—that power is not too great. No one has ever, I believe, been wild enough to say otherwise than that if the opinion of the nation is once deliberately ascertained to be in a particular direction, this House, like the other House, must acquiesce in it. The whole question which we are debating is the means by which the deliberate will of the nation is to be ascertained, and I confess I am still a little puzzled to know what projects that have been suggested now are to increase the power of the House. My impression is, if the noble Duke will forgive me for saying so, that if he and some of the Members I see opposite were to put their heads together to find out what was the proper course to pursue, the initial difficulty might be to find out whether they both agreed as to the object to be attained, and that it would be found that the object sought to be attained by one was to diminish the power of this House, while the noble Duke's idea is to increase it.

I shall vote for my noble friend Lord Cawdor's Motion. I will vote for it upon this ground—that I think the terms are wide enough to include the question of whether there is any reason for attempting to alter the procedure of this House by way of improving it. I myself refuse to admit what one noble Lord stated to-night, that there is a recognised demand in the country for a reform of this House. I deny it. I do not believe any such proposition is to be maintained. There is no doubt that on many platforms and in many places it has been said, and I have no doubt a great many people will be found to support that proposition; but I believe there is no Second Chamber in any Constitutional Government which works so smoothly as does the House of Lords with the House of Commons. Perhaps what Lord Tweedmouth remarked may be true as one reason for it — that the House of Lords and the House of Commons for centuries have been wonderfully harmonious in their relations to each other, and I should hesitate very much to admit that there was any reason why that harmonious condition should not continue. We are not always engaged in a violent political controversy. I deny that the measures of a Liberal Government are not received in this House with perfect impartiality. If you once touch the political question between the two Parties, you will not expect that people will vote against their own political views, but speaking of legislation that does not touch the political question between them, I absolutely deny that what are called Liberal measures — that is to say, measures brought in and promoted by the Liberal Party—are not received in this House with perfect impartiality. Of course, I do not deny that where you do touch the political question you will have people voting according to their political convictions. And now, what is the proposition which is sought to be enforced? You must not have your political convictions. One would suppose that there had been some not altogether proper proceeding. I quite recognise that what the President of the Council said in that somewhat inappropriate phrase which he used (I think inadvertently), involving an imputation of swindling, and fraud, and bad conduct of that character, was not intended to be taken literally. I am quite sure of that.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I think I ought to say that it was not my intention to make any imputation of fraud against any individual or against the opposite Party in this House.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I was quite sure that the noble Lord would say so. But he will forgive me also for saying that, although in this House we are accustomed to his courtesy and candour, I am not quite so sure that when he is addressing a public audience those who attack the House of Lords would quite recognise his analogies as being free from the imputation of misconduct. Supposing I were to say that the noble Lord was one of those persons who, when the game had gone against him, upset the table, and that I made that my particular figure for attempting to alter the constitution, because at a particular moment he had pursued a certain course.

*THE EARL OF CREWE: I think perhaps I might be allowed to say that the noble Duke brought a direct *tu quoque* against us in identical terms, and that therefore the matter appears to me to be equally balanced on both sides.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND: The noble Lord denied that there was any imputation on moral character in his simile; and, as he had done that, I thought I was justified in taking up his simile and returning it upon him.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY: I will not interfere further in this very interesting question. All I will say is, that there is a certain amount of responsibility upon us. I will not deny that it rests on my own side also, and that when we are discussing the House of Lords elsewhere we must remember that audiences outside are not perhaps quite as familiar as we are here with the course of the procedure of this House.

Now what is to be the result of this debate? I have no doubt in the world that my noble friend Lord Cawdor will carry his Resolution; and then, what is to happen? Who is going to be the Constitution-maker, and, what is to be the Constitution? It is all very well to criticise, and to talk a little vaguely about the functions of the two Houses of Parliament; but I should like to know, before we begin this interesting Constitution-mongering, are we agreed upon what is to be the principle? What are we to know about it, and what model are we to take? Are we to begin from the beginning of things? I confess that it is my own opinion, as I have said, that that which gives life to this discussion is the question of what we did last session. That is the real interest of this matter to everybody. One reason why I object, and object very much and very strongly, to the appropriateness of this occasion is that I deny that we are responsible to the House of Commons for what we did last session. We exercised our rights, and I believe we were right in what we did; and I believe it will be considered in the country, if some alteration in the constitution of the House of Lords is agreed to, that we are penitent—that we are sorry for what we did. I am quite sure, if I may refer to the right reverend Bench, that they are not penitent for what they did; and for my own part I may say that if the question were to occur again to-morrow in the same form, I should vote as I voted before; and I believe the great majority of your Lordships would do the same. Then why, on this occasion, when you have got an enormous majority in the House of Commons, do you raise the question? Is it appropriate for the reason that you think you will terrify this House into doing what it does not believe it ought to do? I confess I am very sorry indeed that the question is raised. All I can say for myself is that if I thought I were a Member of a House which had not the courage of its own opinions, and that, knowing and believing, as it did, that the religious instruction of the children of the country was at stake, because a measure had been passed which in our judgment and belief was calculated to injure that education, and that we were bound to protest against that and, so far as we could, to prevent it—I say if I were supposed to belong to a House that could yield to the threat that it should be abolished to-morrow because it had done that thing, I should be ashamed to belong to it for one single hour. I am myself very much against any attempt at "reform," as it is called; I am against tampering with that which has been our security for centuries, and the security of the religion and the liberty of the country.

*THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN: My Lords, as the noble and learned Lord has asked a distinct question, I think I may take it upon myself to say that the object of my noble friend Lord Newton, and of those who agree with him as to the necessity of some reform in this House, is not to strengthen this House in the direction of altering its position in reference to the other branch of the Legislature, and not particularly to strengthen it either in making it a more competent body—for it is in my opinion as it now exists a most competent body—but distinctly to strengthen it by relieving it of some disabilities which, in our opinion, tend to affect it prejudicially in the eyes of the people and to render it more difficult for it to exercise those functions and duties which it has to perform. The noble Lord (Lord Halsbury) objects very strongly to this measure being undertaken at the present moment. He thinks the moment very inopportune, and he asks why it is undertaken now. One reason why it is undertaken now is that it has not been undertaken before. It is not a new question; it has been before the House many, many times; and it is a matter of infinite regret to me, as I am sure it is to my noble friend Lord Newton and to others, that this matter has not been taken in hand long ago by the Conservative Party during their long tenure of office. As to supposing that this Bill has been introduced by Lord Newton now in any way in deference to any sort of agitation that may be going on in the country against any action the House of Lords took in its undoubted rights against the Education Bill or any other Bill, I am perfectly certain that no such imputation as that is to be attributed to my noble friend.

I suppose we may take it for granted that the Amendment of the Lord President of the Council will not be pressed. I cannot conceive how that Amendment can in any degree be considered relevant to the matter in hand. The Bill is directed entirely to making some alterations—reforms as we think they would be—in the constitution of this House. The Amendment of the Lord President of the Council is directed to a totally different subject, that is to say, the relations between this and the other House. And, if the noble and learned Lord will excuse me, I think that in his speech he rather mixed up the two things. They are absolutely separate. And the Amendment of my noble friend, Lord Crewe, is really absolutely irrelevant to the question before the House. I admit at once that I do not think I have anything new to say to your Lordships on this question. I agree with every word which fell from the noble Duke the Duke of Northumberland except his last sentence, in which he expressed a hope that the Amendment of my noble friend Lord Cawdor would be accepted. There I disagree with him, and sincerely hope your Lordships will give a Second Reading to this Bill. In the first place, in view of the fact that His Majesty's Government have announced that they will take no hand whatever in, and will have nothing to do with it, a special Committee and an inquiry, as is suggested by my noble friend, would be useless. I do not see how, under those circumstances, such an inquiry can take place with any prospect of any good result whatever ensuing; it would be absolutely one-sided; it would have to be composed entirely of one Party in the House; and the discussions and Resolutions, if they came to any, of such a Committee would have absolutely no impartial weight whatever. I do not suppose for a moment that my noble friend put this Amendment on the Paper with the intention of its being merely a dilatory Amendment; but I am perfectly certain that that will be its effect; it opens up an immense field of inquiry. It will be perfectly competent at any rate for the Committee to inquire into the constitution of every Second Chamber that exists, and into every kind of suggestion that has been made for their improvement and modification, and into every suggestion as to any possible modification of the constitution and procedure of this House. It is quite obvious that such an inquiry might go on for sessions and for years. I am strongly of opinion that if your Lordships really, to use a common expression, mean business in this matter, and if you really think that either the procedure or the constitution of this House can be in any way amended or improved, the matter should be taken in hand. We have had enough of dilatoriness.

My noble friend who moved the Second Reading of the Bill has narrated to the House the various efforts that have been made from time to time. The noble Lord on the Cross-Benches, Lord Rosebery, in 1884, in a most eloquent and convincing speech, moved for a Select Committee but it all came to nothing. Again, he moved for another Select Committee in 1888, with the same result. I myself, with an extreme temerity which I certainly do not possess now, proposed a Bill on the subject, somewhat on the same lines as the Bill of my noble friend. It was more cautious in some respects, and very much more ambitious in others. That Bill, with the usual result, came to nothing; the Bill was withdrawn on the undertaking of the Prime Minister to bring in a Bill himself dealing with the subject of Life Peerages. That was accepted by Lord Granville, the Leader of the Opposition as, at any rate, an instalment of reform. Bills were introduced on the subject, and dropped—they all came to nothing. That is the history of this movement: there were Motions for Select Committees, Bills were introduced and promises were made; but nothing more happened. I am afraid—nay I am sure—that if your Lordships agree to the Amendment of Lord Cawdor and appoint a Committee to inquire into this whole subject, the result will be the usual one and practically nothing will be done. For these reasons, I most sincerely hope your Lordships will give a Second Reading to the Bill.

I do not see the same objections to the Amendment which is down on the Paper in the name of my noble friend Lord Heneage. In the first place, it is not open to the first objection—that is to say, that His Majesty's Government will abstain from having anything to do with it. The Bill will have been read a second time. If His Majesty's Government consider the principles of the Bill so objectionable that they will have nothing to say to the Bill, either in Committee of the Whole House or when referred to a Select Committee, of course, that is their affair; but that is quite a different thing from their saying that if this Bill is not read a second time, they will have nothing to do with an inquiry into the whole subject. That is quite a different and a much more important matter. Moreover, the scope of my noble friend's (Lord Heneage) Amendment, is very much more limited than that of my noble friend Lord Cawdor. I do not know, of course, what action Lord Newton intends to take in the matter; but, if he presses the Second Reading to a division, I shall certainly vote with him. And if, as I sincerely hope will be the case, the Bill gets a Second Reading, I trust he will accept the Amendment of my noble friend, Lord Heneage, and allow it to go before a Committee such as he suggests.

Then, as to the competence of this House, I do not think it is necessary for me to say anything. Any man who has taken the trouble to investigate the constituent parts of this House on any great occasion, such, for instance, as the discussions on the Education Bill, must admit that as far as its *personnel* is concerned, it would be very difficult, perhaps quite impossible, to find a more competent body by means of election, nomination, or otherwise. All the same, I am gratified to hear my noble friend the Lord President of the Council give his testimony in favour of the efficiency of this House. I am glad the House has found so doughty a champion in its favour, and more particularly so, because I fear that my noble friend's appreciation of the efficiency of the House is not altogether shared by all his colleagues. It was only the other day that one of the most eminent of his colleagues described this House as the most upside down, topsy turvey, muddle-headed Assembly he had ever seen. I do not suppose for a moment that the Lord President of the Council, in testifying to the efficiency of this House, meant to say that it was only efficient in making muddles; and I am sure the House will be glad to find that he takes a very different view from that of the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant. As to the present moment being inopportune to investigate this question of reform I think, on the contrary, that this is particularly opportune.

It must always be a difficult matter for any Second Chamber to determine accurately what the real well-considered will of the people is. But that becomes a matter of extraordinary difficulty when, as in the present case, the lines dividing Parties are not clearly and accurately defined. It would be idle to deny, and I am sure nobody would deny, that the differences existing between sections of the Liberal Party are somewhat acute—so acute, that unquestionably, not only some individuals, but sections of that Party are in some repects much more in accord with sections of the Conservative Party than they are with the great majority of their own Party. And to a certain extent, it is just the same with the Conservative Party. On the greatest possible question of all questions, the fiscal question, there is a minority of the Conservative Party who certainly are more in accord with their opponents in the Liberal Party than they are with the great majority of their own Party. That is a condition of things which, no doubt, will pass away; the lines of cleavage between the Parties will become more distinct, but it is a state of things which is likely to last some time; and as long as it does last it is particularly difficult—and it must be specially difficult for this House—to ascertain what is really the will of the people. I defy any human being to judge from the last General Election on what particular points the people of this country had definitely made up their minds. That being the case, it appears to me to be a very opportune moment for this House to do the utmost it can to add to its efficiency, and to enable it to exercise its very difficult duties in such a manner as to justify itself to the utmost before the people of this country.

I am convinced that the vast majority of the people of this country are entirely in favour of a Second Chamber. I believe they recognise the undoubted fact that any Second Chamber must be of a generally Conservative tendency; because, if it is not, it does not fulfil the functions of a Second Chamber. The functions of a Second Chamber are to revise, to prevent legislation being conducted in too great a hurry, and, if necessary, to hold over legislation until the will of the people can be ascertained. Those are all Conservative tendencies. The whole duty and function of a Second Chamber is to act like the governor of a machine, and to prevent the machine racing, and going too fast. I do not believe that the people of this country object to the House of Lords. What I do think they feel very strongly upon is the idea—possibly a delusion—that the action of this House is largely influenced or dictated by the necessities, the convenience, or the tactics, of a particular Party outside this House. I do not believe the people have any distrust or fear of the mature, independent judgment of the House of Lords *qua* House of Lords, but I do think they have an idea—and that they resent it—that this House is more or less dictated to by the Party Leaders in another place, and that consequently one of the two great Parties of the State, the Conservative Party, is, to all intents and purposes, practically always in power—in power positively when it is in a majority in the House of Commons, because it can then carry any legislation it pleases, and in power negatively when it is in a minority in the House of Commons, because it can then prevent and stop any legislation it pleases.

One of the great difficulties we have to deal with is the fact—and to my mind it is a most regrettable fact—that one Party in the State is always in an enormous majority in this House: but I am bound to say that it is beyond me to imagine how that is to be remedied. As fast as you make Liberal Peers they become Conservatives. What are you to do about it? If you could imagine an absolutely impartial person from some other planet investigating our political affairs, I am not at all clear upon which of the two Houses that person would put the blame—how far he would say this House errs in lagging too far behind the steady advance of public opinion, or how far he would say the other House is, at times, very much in advance of the steady march of public opinion. There is one thing which is a very small thing in itself, but which, I think, has had a very bad effect upon the way in which this House is viewed by the country. I sometimes think your Lordships do not pay sufficient attention to the appearances of things, and to the way in which matters in this House appear to the people of the country. The small matter to which I refer is a very simply thing, namely, that there is in this House no authority to order the conduct of debate, nobody who exercises the functions of the Speaker in the House of Commons, nobody who decides who is to speak when several of your Lordships rise together. That has, I think, a very bad effect upon debates: in the first place, it is exceedingly unfair to any of your Lordships who has a diffidence due to the infusion of Irish blood in his veins, and it gives an enormous advantage to the purely Scottish and English Peers—I think, perhaps, to the former rather than to the latter. But the real result of it is that, as your Lordships know very well, debates, and most important debates, are very apt in this House to fall very speedily into the hands of the two Front Benches. We hear over and over again most excellent and eloquent speeches from the mover and seconder of the Address, and we hear most eloquent speeches from the Leaders of the Government and of the Opposition, expressing the most ardent desire that the voices of those two noble Lords shall be constantly heard in the debates in this House. What does that all amount to? Merely a polite and pious expression of opinion. It is practically impossible for any independent Peer to get an opportunity of speaking. And how does that present itself to the country? The question is debated purely by Cabinet Ministers and ex-Cabinet Ministers, and then, when it comes to a division, a vast number of Peers are brought down to the House who take comparatively little interest in the business of the House ordinarily, and who vote and decide in a matter of great importance to the country. I do not mean to say at all that that is a true picture, but it is a picture that presents itself to the people, and it has to be considered. As a matter of fact, divisions can be swamped by a number of Peers who as a rule do not devote themselves at all to politics. I think that evil is exaggerated, but at the same time I am bound to admit that I think it is a scandal, and a scandal that ought to be removed. There are a number—perhaps not a great number, but a certain number—of Members of this House who (and it is no blame to them whatever) have no inclination to politics. They do not take to them kindly, and they do not interest themselves in the business of the House at all; and yet they do occasionally, on great occasions, come down and vote, and they might possibly turn a division on a very critical question.

And then there is really the very small question of what have been called "black sheep"—or what I should prefer to call "undesirables," because I think it is a more polite term. Well, I do not know whether there are any. I am sure if there are any they are very few, but there may be some who may properly be considered undesirables. The Bill of my noble friend appears to me to contain indications of means for the solutions of these difficulties. It introduces the principle of delegation in the English Peerage, much in the same way as it already exists in the case of the peerages of Ireland and of Scotland. I can see no objection to that, except that I should much prefer it in the way in which I introduced it in my Bill of twenty years ago; because according to my noble friend you would have to deprive a certain number of Peers of rights which are theirs, and to which they were born, whereas I only proposed in my Bill that it should be brought about gradually, and should come into effect on succession. As a matter of fact, through the lapse of time, the result which my noble friend desires would have been brought about under my Bill without depriving any man of any rights which he has. However, let that pass. I cannot see the strength of the argument against it which was used by my noble friend Lord Cawdor. He presented to the House a somewhat harrowing picture of the calamity it would be to the Empire, and to the country, and to this House, if, under such an arrangement, my noble friend the Leader of the Opposition and my noble friend on the Cross-Benches, Lord Rosebery, had never had a seat in this House. It is theoretically possible that under a system of delegation they might not have got a seat in this House. It is possible that there may be many "mute, inglorious Miltons" concealed in the recesses of the Irish and Scottish Peerages who are not sitting in this House. But I ask your Lordships, as men of common sense, if you think it likely that my noble friend Lord Lansdowne or my noble friend Lord Rosebery would have failed, under a system such as is introduced in this Bill, of being elected in this House. Of course, they would have been elected.

I venture to urge upon your Lordships to give a Second Reading to this Bill. In the broadest sense the House would be committing itself merely to the principle that some improvement in the Constitution and in the procedure of the House is possible and desirable. In another sense you would commit yourselves to two broad principles, and to two only—first of all, the principle which has been accepted by, among others, the late Lord Salisbury—that a larger creation of life peerages is desirable; and secondly, that it is desirable to do away with the undesirables, and to diminish the difficulties which may be created by the influx of Peers who, as a rule, take no part in politics or in the proceedings of the House. The rest of the Bill consists merely of details which may be altered to any extent by the Committee which my noble friend proposes to have, or by a Committee of the Whole House. The two principal points are, first, the creation of life peerages, and, secondly, in order to prevent the House being of an unwieldy size, the application to the peerage of England of the principle which exists in the Irish and Scottish peerage. If your Lordships do not consider that this house is in a state of absolute perfection, if your Lordships consider that anything which is advisable should be done, and that every step should be taken that can legitimately be taken to strengthen this House, and if your Lordships do not object in the main to those two large principles, I cannot see why you should not give a Second Reading to this Bill. And I hope, if you do give it a Second Reading, that the Amendment of my noble friend Lord Heneage will be accepted. The reform of an ancient institution such as this House is a matter not to be undertaken lightly. I myself can quite understand the theory which I think was held by the noble and learned Lord Halsbury, and I think by my noble friend Lord Cawdor, that it is a dangerous thing to touch in any way so ancient a fabric as this House; but I do not agree with that theory. I think, on the contrary, that however ancient and venerable the House may be, however hallowed by tradition and by history, if it is to continue to fulfil the duties for which it is created, if it is to be useful and to be of service, it is necessary that it should from time to time be adapted to the change of circumstances and to the requirements of modern times.

EARL CAWDOR: I did not suggest that it could not be reformed.

*THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN: No, but at the same time my noble friend objected to anything in the Bill of the nature of reform.

EARL CAWDOR: No, I did not.

*THE EARL OF DUNRAVEN: At any rate, if your Lordships are of opinion that there is room for improvement—and that is a matter which your Lordships can hardly deny—I beg you not to agree to an Amendment which, whatever its intention, is and must be of a dilatory character, but to show that you do intend to take the matter in hand, and to deal with it in some way or another, by giving, as an earnest of your intention, a Second Reading to the Bill, and by also consenting to the appointment of the Committee which my noble friend Lord Heneage proposes.

*LORD MONTAGU OF BEAULIEU: At this late stage of the sitting I will not detain your Lordships long, but there are one or two remarks which I should like to be allowed to make, as a junior Member of this House, on the ground that the front benches may have got into the state of duelling mentioned by the last speaker, and that may be there are those on the back benches who might advantageously be heard upon the subject. It has struck me very much, in listening to this debate, that we are living here too much in a world of our own, and that we are hardly in touch with the great mass of public opinion outside. All the virtues of this House are well known to those who are familiar with its proceedings, but it seems to me that what we want to do is to reform any parts of its procedure or methods which are likely to come into conflict with public opinion. I do not mean public opinion as represented in a transient majority in the House of Commons, but the good sense of the nation as a whole. What we have got to look at is not so much the past as the future. It seems to me that we are entering on a time of storm and stress, and that we are likely to be brought into conflict with Parliamentary representatives elsewhere, more and more as time goes on. When this House consisted of representatives, more or less equally divided, of the two great Parties in the State, there could be no cry from any particular Party for its abolition. But it is evident that now one Party in the State is — for reasons which I think are sufficiently obvious—more or less pledged—at least a great many of its members are pledged—against a Second Chamber, or at all events are pledged to the mutilation of the powers of this Chamber. That is a very dangerous state of things, and although I thoroughly agree with what Lord Cawdor has said as to the necessity of approaching this subject very carefully, at the same time I think we may take a parallel from the case of old buildings, or even from, I was going to say, the teachings of science in regard to life of all kinds. If you do not repair decay, and do not cast out that which is bad, the whole fabric in the long run is likely to fall to pieces. If you come to think of it, there are some points as to the procedure of this House, and as to some of the Members who compose it, which it is very difficult to defend. I say, for instance, that a Peer who has never taken his seat here, and who has never taken part in debates, cannot claim to be hardly treated if he is debarred from doing so in the future; and I certainly think that for all practical purposes, the House will have to do something in the nature of delegating its powers, either by appointing more Standing Committees, or by means of some other tribunal, to deal with pressing public business. After all, it is not so much, to my mind, a question of the House of Lords resisting any particular reform; because in other countries, wherever you look—the United States, France, or the Colonies themselves—you see the Legislative Councils, as they are called in the Colonies, or the Senate, as it is called in the United States, very often coming into collision with the representatives in the Lower Chamber. Therefore I think it is not so much a question of the revising character of this House which we are proposing to reform, because, as has been said, a Chamber of this kind must be naturally in its tendencies Conservative; but I do think there are defects in this House, which need reform, and which are courageously attacked—although I do not agree with every word of the noble Lord's Bill—by the Bill which Lord Newton has introduced.

I think the principle of that Bill is good, and I am certainly inclined to vote for its Second Reading. If we take, for instance, the question of Peers who have never taken their seats, and who have never been in the House of Commons, it is difficult to defend their retention in this House. Supposing you had a debate of immense national significance in this House—say, on a Home Rule Bill—and it happened that the particular measure brought forward was defeated by only a narrow majority, a majority so small as to make the analysis of every Member of the House who had voted upon it a particularly acute one. If that was so, it might be said that the vote had been carried by a majority of Peers who had hardly ever voted before, and who perhaps had only just qualified to vote in that particular division. I do not think that would be a good argument for this House. I think therefore that we should take note of our weaknessess, and take measures in time which are necessary to remedy them. As to the differences between the two Houses, I do not think they are intended to be touched upon by the Bill. That matter might be dealt with by some form of referendum, and would probably be dealt with better in that way than in any other. That would only be following the precedent in many other countries. But the Bill as it stands does attempt—perhaps in too drastic a form—to remove admitted defects. And as regards the added Members, surely, as the whole Constitution of the House of Lords is based on—shall I say—the principle of heredity tempered by selection, can be no real objection to that. His Majesty's Government selects a certain number of distinguished, or comparatively distinguished, people, from time to time, and adds them to this House, and those additions are made by every successive Government; that is the form of creation by which Members are being added to this House. All that Lord Newton proposes is to enlarge and widen that power of selection, to give to the Government of the day the power of adding to the number of life Peers, and in that way to extend a principle which we accept to-day without demur. There are added in this way to your Lordships' House—certainly on the Opposition side of the House—those who have had legislative experience; and taken as a whole, those who are added are added for public services of some kind or other; and if that principle has worked well in the past, I do not see why it should not work well in the future. It seems to me that the principle is perfectly logical and not contrary to the real traditions of the House of Lords.

It has been said that this House is not representative and not responsible. Personally I should deny both those accusations. I think it is highly representative in the true sense of the word, inasmuch as you cannot look round this House without seeing on both sides almost every kind of interest in the State represented by someone who can speak with authority. In that sense it is representative, although of course it is not in any way elective. It is also responsible, because it seems to me we are always responsible ultimately to the will of the nation as expressed at an election. That is a perfectly well understood thing, and the responsibility is not only the responsibility of this kind of referendum—because a general election is a kind of referendum—but we have a responsibility, as we know well, to the general public wish of the nation, which expresses itself in these days in many ways, and I am perfectly certain that the House of Lords will never set itself up against the nation to its own destruction. But, my Lords, it is responsible in another sense. It is responsible in the sense that we wish our order to continue. We wish this House to endure, and I feel certain that besides the responsibility to do our duty to the nation we feel another duty which we have to discharge to posterity. I feel certain that even if the Second Reading of Lord Newton's Bill is not carried—even if the Committee suggested by himself or Lord Cawdor comes to nothing—still there is the germ of reform in this Bill—a germ sufficiently good to make the idea prevail, and the main outlines will be acceptable, I believe, in time to come. I feel certain that something must be done, and it would be better done when this side of the House was represented in the Government of the other House, because it would be easier to carry it through. I think that the *non possumus* of the Government—the attitude of negation—is a somewhat weak one, for there must be men on the Government side of both Houses who desire to see the presence of a Second Chamber, and who, in their hearts, do not wish that the Second Chamber should be inefficient and bad. Therefore it seems to be that the Government would have met the case better by producing their own scheme of reform, and by taking into co-operation the noble Lord, Lord Newton, They would thereby have assisted in the reformation of, or the doing away with, those parts of this House, or of those parts of its procedure and constitution which are no longer of value. We are, as I have said, to a great extent the trustees of posterity, and we should strive our utmost to preserve all that is good in this House. This House has done splendid work for the country in the past, and I hope that it will continue to do so for many years to come; but at the same time, it would be foolish of this House to turn a deaf ear in this matter. There are a number of our fellow countrymen who, while they hold to a Second Chamber and while they like this House, still see defects in it which they wish removed, and it is because I think the noble Lord's Bill will go some way towards doing that that I hope your Lordships will see your way to give it a Second Reading.

THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY: My Lords, I move that this debate be now adjourned.

On Question, debate adjourned till to-morrow, and to be taken first.

STANDING ORDERS RELATING TO APPEALS.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Loreburn): I can tell your Lordships in two or three sentences what is the purpose of this Motion. Appeals in England must be made—legal appeals to this House—within a twelvemonth, whereas in Scotland the period is two years, or it may be more. The purpose of this Bill is (in compliance with the desires expressed from various parts of Scotland) that appeals from the Scottish Courts to this House may be brought within the twelve months limit in the same way as in England, in order that in Scotland successful litigants may feel that they have the same security as in England after twelve months have elapsed.

Moved, that Standing Orders Nos. I. V., VIII., and X. be amended as follows:—

Note.—The words in SMALL CAPITALS are to be omitted, and the words printed in *Italics* are to be inserted.

STANDING ORDER I.

(STANDING ORDER I. IS ONLY APPLICABLE TO DECREES, ETC., PRONOUNCED ON AND AFTER THE 1ST DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1876.)

Ordered, that, EXCEPT WHERE OTHERWISE PROVIDED BY STATUTE, no petition of appeal be received by this House unless the same be lodged in the Parliament Office for presentation to the House within one year from the date of the last decree, order, judgment, or interlocutor appealed from.

In cases in which the person entitled to appeal BE *is* within the age of one and twenty years, or covert, *non compos mentis*, imprisoned, or out of Great Britain and Ireland, such person may be at liberty to present his appeal to the House, provided that the same be lodged in the Parliament Office within one year next after full age, discoverture, coming of sound mind, enlargement out of prison, coming into Great Britain or Ireland: But in no case shall any person or persons be allowed a longer time, on account of mere absence, to present an appeal, than five years from the date of the last decree, order, judgment, or interlocutor appealed against.

Provided that this Standing Order shall not apply to any appeal from the Court of Session in Scotland against a final interlocutor or interlocutory judgment pronounced before the first day of June, 1907; but no such appeal shall be received by this House after the first day of June, 1908.

STANDING ORDER V.

1. Ordered, that IN ENGLISH APPEALS the printed CASES *Case* and the Appendix thereto be in the Parliament Office within six weeks from the date of the presentation of the appeal to the House; IN SCOTCH AND IRISH APPEALS, WITHIN EIGHT WEEKS; and the appeal *be* set down for hearing on the first *sitting* day *thereafter* AFTER THE EXPIRATION OF THOSE RESPECTIVE PERIODS (or as soon before, at the option of either party, as all the printed Cases and the Appendix shall have been lodged); on default by the Appellant, the Appeal to stand dismissed.

2. Ordered, that in all appeals from Scotland the Appellant alone, in his printed Case or in the Appendix thereto, shall lay before this House a printed copy of the record as authenticated by the Lord Ordinary; together with a supplement containing an account, without argument *or* OF statement of other facts of the further steps which have been taken in the case since the record was completed, and containing also copies of the interlocutors or parts of interlocutors complained of; and each party shall, in *his Case*, THEIR CASES lay before the House a copy of the Case presented by *him* THEM RESPECTIVELY to the Court of Session, if any such Case was presented there, with a short summary of any additional reasons upon which he means to insist; and if there shall have been no case presented to the Court of Session, then each party shall set forth in his Case the reasons upon which he founds his argument, as shortly and succinctly as possible.

3. Ordered, that *the printed case* ALL PRINTED CASES be signed by one or more counsel, who shall have attended as counsel in the Court below, or shall purpose attending as counsel at the hearing in this House.

STANDING ORDER VIII.

Ordered, that in the event of abatement by death or defect through bankruptcy, an appeal shall not stand dismissed for default under Standing Orders Nos. III., IV., V., provided that notice of such abatement or defect be given *by a letter from the Appellant's Agent* BY LETTER addressed to the Clerk of the Parliaments and lodged in the Judicial Office prior to the expiration of the period limited by the Standing Order under which the appeal would otherwise have stood dismissed.

Ordered, that all appeals marked on the Cause List of the House as abated or defective shall stand dismissed unless within three months from the date of the notice to the Clerk of the Parliaments of abatement or defect, if the House be then sitting, or, if not, then not later than the third sitting day of the next ensuing sittings of the House, a petition shall be presented to the House for reviving the appeal or for rendering the same effective.

Ordered, that *when an appeal has abated or become defective after the printed cases have been lodged, and it is subsequently revived or rendered effective*, WHERE ANY PARTY OR PARTIES TO AN APPEAL SHALL DIE PENDING THE SAME, SUBSEQUENTLY TO THE PRINTED CASES HAVING BEEN LODGED, AND THE APPEAL SHALL BE REVIVED AGAINST HIS OR HER REPRESENTATIVE OR REPRESENTATIVES AS THE PERSON OR PERSONS STANDING IN THE PLACE OF THE PERSON OR PERSONS SO DYING AS AFORESAID, a Supplemental Case shall be lodged by the *Appellant* PARTY OR PARTIES SO REVIVING THE SAME RESPECTIVELY, STATING *setting forth* the Order or Orders made by the House IN SUCH CASE *reviving the appeal or rendering the same effective.*

The like rule shall be observed by the Appellant and Respondent respectively, where any person or persons shall, by leave of the House, upon petition or otherwise, be added as a party or parties to the said appeal after the printed cases in such appeal shall have been lodged.

STANDING ORDER X.

Ordered, that the Clerk of the Parliaments shall appoint such person as he may think fit as Taxing Officer, and in all cases in which this House shall make any order for payment of costs by any party or parties in any cause, *the amount thereof to be certified by the Clerk of the Parliaments,* WITHOUT SPECIFYING THE AMOUNT, the Taxing Officer *shall* MAY, UPON THE APPLICATION OF EITHER PARTY, tax *the Bill of the Costs so ordered to be paid.* and ascertain the amount thereof, and report the same to the Clerk of the Parliaments or Clerk Assistant: And, it is further ordered, that the same FEES *fee* shall be demanded from and paid by the party applying for such taxation for and in respect thereof as *is* ARE now *charged* or shall be fixed by any resolution of this House CONCERNING SUCH FEES; and *such fee shall be added at the foot of the said Bill of Costs as taxed* THE TAXING OFFICER MAY, IF HE THINK FIT, EITHER ADD OR DEDUCT THE WHOLE OR A PART OF SUCH FEES AT THE FOOT OF HIS REPORT: And the Clerk of the Parliaments or Clerk Assistant may give a certificate of such costs, expressing the amount so reported to him as aforesaid, and in his certificate, *as well as in the Taxing Officer's Report*, regard shall be had to the sum of £200 where that amount has been paid in to the account of the Security Fund Account of the House as directed by Standing Order No. 4; and the amount in money certified by him in such certificate shall be the sum to be demanded and paid under or by virtue of such order as aforesaid for payment of costs.—(*The Lord Chancellor*); agreed to: The said Standing Orders amended accordingly, and to be printed as amended. (No. 52.)

NEW BILL.

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to repeal section 57 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1901, and certain words in section 7 of the Coal Mines regulation Act, 1887, relating to the employment of women and children —Was *presented* by the Earl Beauchamp; read 1ª; and to be *printed.* (No. 53.)

House adjourned at twenty minutes before Twelve o'clock, till To-morrow, half-past Ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 6th May, 1907.

The House met at a quarter before three of the Clock.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.:—King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill [Lords]; Royal Bank of Scotland Bill [Lords]; Southend Water Bill [Lords]; Birmingham Corporation Water Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time,

Bristol Corporation Bill. Read the third time, and passed.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill. As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

Baines' Name Bill [Lords]; Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill [Lords]; Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill [Lords]. Read a second time, and committed.

Mullingar, Kells, and Drogheda Railway Bill. Reported [Parties do not proceed]; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION (SPECIAL RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION) BILL.

Petition of the Personal Rights Association, Sarum and Wilts, against; to lie upon the Table.

LIQUOR TRAFFIC (LOCAL OPTION) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Langside, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petitions against; from Middleton Cheney; and, Swayfield; to lie upon the Table.

PAUPER LUNATICS (COST OF MAINTENANCE).

Petitions for legislation; From Swindon; and, Highworth; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Annual Report of the Commissioners of Education in Ireland for the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Report, Annual Series, No. 3773 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Twelfth Annual Report of the Local Government Board for Scotland, 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1897.

Copy presented, of Ninth Annual Report of the Congested Districts (Scotland) Board to the Secretary for Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Reports, Statistics, etc., on Continuation Classes and Central Institutions (Scotland), 1905–6 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ALIENS ACT, 1905.

Copy presented, of First Annual Report of His Majesty's Inspector under the Aliens Act (Part I.), and a Statement with regard to the Expulsion of Aliens (Part II.), in respect of the year 1906 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Bath, preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire, Vol. II. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table,

HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented, of Report on the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, K.G., preserved at Welbeck Abbey, Vol. VIII. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL DEBT.

Copy presented, of Return showing; (1) the Aggregate Gross Liabilities of the State as represented by the Nominal Funded Debt, Estimated Capital Liability in respect of Terminable Annuities, Unfunded Debt, and other Liabilities in respect of Debt, the Estimated Assets, and the Exchequer Balances at the close of each financial year from 1835–6 to 1906–7, both inclusive; and (2) the Gross and Net Expenditure charged annually during that period against the Public Revenue on account of the National Debt, and other Payments connected with Capital Liabilities [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS (IRELAND) PENSION FUND.

Annual Accounts presented, of Receipts and Payments for the year ended 31st December, 1906, [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1884.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 30th April, 1907, declaring that Frederick Campion, Forger, King's Yard, Gibraltar, War Office, was appointed without a Civil Service Certificate through inadvertence on the part of the Head of his Department [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE AND FISHERIES.

Copy presented, of Memorandum of Evidence contained in Parliamentary Papers as to the Demand for Allotments and Small Holdings, and as to the difficulty of obtaining land for those purposes [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRANSVAAL.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to the Introduction of Chinese Labourers into the Transvaal in excess of the number of Licences issued [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (EXCISE COMMITTEE).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 18th April; *Mr. Herbert Roberts*]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CIRCULATED WITH THE VOTES.

Mr. Delmege's Glensharrold Estate.

Mr. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether the estate of Mr. James O'Grady Delmege, situate at Glensharrold, in the county of Limerick, is in the Land Judge's Court; and, if so, whether any steps have been taken to bring about a sale of it to the tenants under the Land Act of 1903.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The registrar of the Land Judge's Court informs me that no proceedings are pending in that court for the sale of the estate referred to.

Irish Money-Lenders.

Mr. CARR-GOMM (Southwark, Rotherhithe): To ask Mr. Attorney-General whether his attention has been called to the complaints as to the wording of the Money-Lenders Act, 1900, which have been made in many recent cases in the courts; and whether, in view of the increasing number of these cases in all parts of the country and the methods of money-lenders which are being thereby brought under public notice, he will introduce a Bill to amend this Act.

(*Answered by Sir John Walton.*) This matter is under the consideration of the Lord Chancellor, with whom the hon. Member would do well to communicate.

Postage on Christmas Supplements.

Mr. J. MACVEAGH (Down, S.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he will consider the desirability of facilitating the issue of Christmas supplements by weekly newspapers, by the establishment of a special registration fee or otherwise, having regard to the fact that the illustrated and other papers of much greater bulk and weight are conveyed by post without extra cost.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Christmas supplements to registered newspapers are transmissible by the halfpenny newspaper post if they conform to the provisions of the Post Office Act of 1870. The newspaper post is carried on at a considerable loss, and I do not see my way to introducing fresh legislation enlarging its scope.

Plymouth Post Office Revision.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): To ask the Postmaster-General whether he can say how long it will be before the projected revision at Plymouth will be put into force; and whether he will give instructions for overtime money earned on Easter Sunday to be paid forthwith.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The revision in question is now under consideration, and steps will be taken to carry it out as soon as possible. Instructions had been given for payment of the overtime worked on Easter Sunday before the hon. Member put down his Question, and the men have received the money.

Mr. Mackay of Brora.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that Mr. D. Mackay, of Brora, has applied on two occasions to be furnished with a copy of his record, and has received no reply; and that Mr. Mackay has applied for an overcoat due to him last October, and can get no reply to this application either; and can he explain why these applications have been ignored.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) I am making inquiry into the matters referred to in the hon. Member's Question, and I will communicate the result to him.

Boyle Mounted Postman.

Mr. JAMES O'CONNOR: To ask the Postmaster-General whether he is aware that Mr. John Ryan, mounted postman, of Boyle, Roscommon, made application for an increased horse allowance a year ago; that although he submitted particulars showing that his allowance was entirely inadequate, and these have been corroborated by departmental inquiries, no reply has yet been given to him; and will he give the matter his prompt and favourable consideration.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) Authority has already been given for increasing the allowance made to this postman for the use of a pony, and I have now directed that the increase is to take effect from the date of his application.

Income Tax Incidence.

Lord BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it has been the intention in previous Finance Acts to mitigate the effect of the five years average as the basis of assessment to income-tax in the case of commercial concerns producing profits of a fluctuating character, especially when an average was sought to be attained by adding the higher profits of past years to diminishing profits of declining businesses; whether he will consider the propriety of substituting for the clause to be omitted some more effective remedy for the admitted hardships of the rigid application of the five years average system; and whether, in considering this question, he will have regard also to the amount of the deductions which ought to be allowed from gross profits before fixing their value for assessment, in respect of such things as depreciation of plant and machinery, or the replacement of capital expended in the acquisition of such things as leasehold interests in property, or mines liable to be exhausted in a short period of years.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) No such intention is within my knowledge. The various considerations to which reference is made in the Question as bearing upon the assessment of profits were all fully considered by Lord Ritchie's Committee, and are discussed in Parts V. and VI. of the Committee's Report [Cd. 2575]. It may be added that the period over which an average is taken is three years for most trading concerns, and is extended to five years only in the case of mines.

Madras Estates Land Bill.

Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Madras Government has under consideration the question of compensating landowners for the universal occupancy right conceded to their tenants by the Madras Estates Land Bill; whether that Bill takes power to Government to revise rents in zemindaris; if so, whether the Bill contains any provision that such power of revision shall not be exercised without the previous sanction of the Governor General in Council; and, if not, whether he will explain why the ancient zemindars of Madras are to be placed in this respect in an inferior position to the statute-created landlords of Bengal.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Bill to which the hon. Member refers is at present under my consideration, and I am not in a position at the present stage to make any statement as to its provisions.

Mr. Langley's Gortnahoe Estate.

Mr. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say whether the estate of Henry Oliver Langley, of Longford Pass, parish of Gortnahoe, county Tipperary, is sold to the Estates Commissioners; and, if so, what steps are being taken to reinstate Michael Morris and Edward Kealy, two evicted tenants on the property.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners inform me that the estate referred to has not been sold to them, but they are negotiating with Mr. Langley for the purchase of certain untenanted lands on his property at Longford Pass. The Commissioners have received their inspector's report on the application of Michael Morris for reinstatement, and it is under consideration. Edward Kealy's application has been referred to an inspector for inquiry, but his report has not yet been received.

Military Offences among Cavalrymen.

Sir CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): To ask the Secretary of State for War if he can throw light on the causes of the apparent increase of military offences in the cavalry of the line as compared with the decrease in the Army generally.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) It is very difficult to state exactly the causes of the increase mentioned, which is not a large increase, amounting to forty-eight out of a total of 607. The number of recruits taken last year was 3,664, as compared with 2,375 in the previous year, and this increase in the number of men just beginning their service would appear to have had a corresponding result in respect of military offences.

Militia Reserve.

Sir CHARLES DILKE: To ask the Secretary of State for War if he can inform the House what is to be the future of the Reserve Division of Militia, of which the strength is shown as 7,783 on 1st October last; whether it is still intended that it shall disappear; and whether in the meantime it is to be attached to the Territorial Army in Great Britain and to the Militia in Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) All the engagements for this Reserve have been stopped, except for the men from the Royal Garrison Regiment. These latter are discharged from this Reserve as soon as they have made up the qualified term for pension. This Reserve accordingly will gradually disappear. It will remain as an independent force till it dies out.

Army Finance.

Sir CHARLES DILKE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether moneys required for the Territorial Army under Clause 3 of the Territorial and

Reserve Forces Bill will be Army Votes within the accounting charge of the Director of Army Finance as accounting officer.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) The payments to be made to county associations for the purposes of the Territorial Force will be made from Army Votes within the accounting charge of the Director General of Army Finance as accounting officer. Expenditure conducted by the associations will be on a footing similar to that now conducted by Volunteer corps out of their public grants. I hope before long to be able to lay before the House details of what is proposed.

Territorial Force—Increased Estimate.

SIR CHARLES DILKE: To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he now sees his way to carry out his undertaking, either by distributing a supplementary document or in some other way, to show contemplated increase on the previous approximate estimate for the Territorial Forces.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Haldane.*) I hope to fulfil this undertaking before the Committee Stage of the Bill is reached.

New Hebrides Convention.

MR. WALROND (Devonshire, Tiverton): To ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what negotiations are now in progress with the French Government about the New Hebrides Convention; and when he will lay Papers upon the subject accounting for the delay in dealing with the matter.

(*Answered by Secretary Sir Edward Grey.*) The date of the meeting of the Joint Committee to deal with Sub-section 4, of Article 10, will probably be in about a week's time. The date is being arranged to suit the convenience of the Colonial representatives. As regards the labour regulations, it has already been promised that Papers will be laid showing the conditions under which licences will be issued before any recruiting takes place. Till these conditions are finally settled the Papers cannot be laid.

Committee on the Bankruptcy Laws.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): To ask the President of the Board of Trade when he anticipates the Committee appointed to inquire into the Bankruptcy Laws in England will present its Report; and whether he has any intention of asking the same or another Committee to inquire into the condition of bankruptcy reform in Scotland.

(*Answered by Mr. Kearley.*) I am informed that the Committee hope to conclude the taking of evidence shortly, and the Report will follow in due course. My right hon. friend has no intention of asking a Committee to inquire into the condition of bankruptcy reform in Scotland.

Bute Licensing Appeals.

MR. CLELAND (Glasgow, Bridgeton): To ask the Lord Advocate whether the clerk of the Justice of the Peace Court for the county of Bute who advises that court on legal matters upon licensing appeals, is in the habit of attending in the Burgh Licensing Court in support of the application of private individuals for the grant of licences; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take to prevent the repetition of such action.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) The disqualification of the clerk to the Justice of Peace Court does not apply by law so as to prevent him acting as solicitor in the Burgh Court. This seems to be the sound construction of Section 106 of the Licensing (Scotland Act, 1903.

Lord Advocate v. Colonel Balfour.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): To ask the Lord Advocate if the Government propose to acquiesce in the recent decision, the Lord Advocate *v.* Colonel Balfour.

(*Answered by Mr. Thomas Shaw.*) Yes, sir.

Motor Car Bill.

MR. WALROND: To ask the President of the Local Government Board when it is proposed to introduce legislation dealing with motor cars.

(*Answered by Dr. Macnamara.*) As my right hon. friend the President of the Local Government Board stated, in reply to a Question last week, he cannot at present make any announcement with regard to this matter.

Military Drill in Elementary Schools.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.): To ask the President of the Board of Education does the Education Department adhere to the position in relation to rifle shooting and military drill in public elementary schools which was explained to the House by his predecessor in October last,† or in what respects, if any, has it been modified.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) The Answer is in the affirmative.

Lewisham Schools Rifle Association.

Mr. BYLES: To ask the President of the Board of Education is he aware that in the metropolitan borough of Lewisham a school rifle association has been formed; that it has been joined by forty out of forty-three public elementary schools containing 2,600 boys, and that all these boys, who are over twelve years of age, are required to shoot with miniature rifles; will he say whether these pupils are instructed in the art and inculcated with the duty of killing their fellow men; and whether the cost of such instruction, or any part of it, falls upon the public.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I understand that a school rifle association has been formed, but I have no information as to its membership. No part of the instruction is allowed to be given during school hours or at the public expense.

Public Elementary School Buildings.

Lord R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): To ask the President of the Board of Education when he will introduce the measure legalising the expenditure of public money upon the erection of public elementary schools.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) I have nothing to add to the Answer which I gave to the noble Lord the Member for the Chichester Division on the 18th April last.†

Education Board—Medical Department.

Mr. WEDGWOOD (Newcastle-under-Lyme): To ask the President of the Board of Education on what expert opinion Clause 10 of the Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill was drafted; and whether this expert opinion reported as well upon the necessity of establishing a permanent medical department at the Board of Education, and, if so, what their view of such a medical department was.

(*Answered by Mr. McKenna.*) Clause 10 of the Administrative Provisions Bill follows precisely the wording of the similar clause in last year's Bill, as amended in Parliament. A considerable volume of expert opinion bearing on the subject will be found in the Reports of the Inter-departmental Committees on Physical Deterioration and on the Medical Inspection and Feeding of School Children which have already been published. I do not think the matters referred to in the last paragraph can be adequately dealt with by means of Question and Answer. There will be an opportunity for discussing them in Committee on the Bill.

Edinburgh Grassmarket.

Mr. GULLAND (Dumfries Burghs): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether he is aware that the town council of Edinburgh proposes to hold a market for sheep and possibly also for cattle in the public street of the Grassmarket, which is not concreted and in which there is much traffic; and whether the Board of Agriculture proposes to make an order prohibiting such a market, in view of their action at Haddington, where the Board has objected to the market being held on a street that is not laid with cement, even though it is off the main thoroughfare.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) The Edinburgh Town Council propose as a purely temporary measure, pending the completion of their new market at Gorgie, to make special provision for the accommodation of stock in the Grassmarket, to be used only on occasions when the accommodation in the present market, part of which is required immediately for the new Art Schools, is insufficient. Steps will be taken to have the surface paved with cement in compliance with the Markets and Sales Orders of 1903 and 1904. In the circumstances, the Board see no reason to object the proposed arrangement. The case of Haddington Market is not a parallel one.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxiii., 704-5.

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 1159.

Agriculture and Fisheries Grant.

Mr. C. B. HARMSWORTH (Worcestershire, Droitwich): To ask the hon. Member for South Somerset, as representing the President of the Board of Agriculture, whether, having regard to the fact that the total State grant for the encouragement and development of agriculture and fisheries in Great Britain is less than the 850th part of the estimated national expenditure for the financial year 1907–8, he will take steps to secure an increase in the amount of the said grant.

(*Answered by Sir Edward Strachey.*) We shall not hesitate to bring the claims of agriculture and fisheries under the notice of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer as occasion arises, but I am afraid that he would not regard the proportion which our Vote bears to the aggregate expenditure of the State as a very cogent argument.

Lahore Mass Meeting.

Mr. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been directed to the resolutions passed at a mass meeting of Mohammedans at Lahore condemning the recent assaults by natives on Europeans, and calling upon educational authorities to suppress disreputable political excesses amongst students; and, whether the Government of India propose to take any steps to support the educational authorities in such action.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) I am aware of the resolutions to which the hon. Member refers. The Government of India are taking measures that will assure to the universities the support of Government in performing their disciplinary functions, and are issuing general instructions to the local governments which I understand will shortly be published.

Ulster Justices of the Peace.

Mr. J. DEVLIN (Belfast, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he could state how many persons were appointed justices of the peace in Ulster from the 31st of January, 1906 to the 31st of March, 1907; how many of the justices so appointed were Catholics; and, whether he would order a Return to be prepared setting forth the names of those appointed, their religious persuasion, and the districts for which they were appointed.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Lord Chancellor informs me that, during the period mentioned in the Question, he signed warrants for the appointment of 241 magistrates for Ulster exclusive of the borough of Belfast, and 136 of these magistrates are believed to be Catholics. During the same period twenty-seven appointments were made to the commission of the peace for the borough of Belfast, but the Lord Chancellor has no information as to the religious belief of the persons appointed. It would be contrary to practice to grant a Return setting forth the religious persuasion of magistrates individually. The Lord Chancellor also thinks it undesirable to state the petty sessions districts to which individual magistrates have been assigned. The allocation of magistrates to districts is a matter which rests entirely with the Lord Chancellor himself, and he has frequent occasion to vary the districts so assigned.

Muckross Barytes Mines.

Mr. EDWARD BARRY (Cork County, S.) To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether an inspector from the Department of Agriculture visited Barytes mines at Muckross, Clonakilty, some months ago; whether he made a full inspection and Report; and, if so, whether a copy of that Report is available.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Economic Geologist of the Department of Agriculture has made an inspection of the Barytes mine referred to, and has furnished a Report on the subject to the Department. The inspection was undertaken in pursuance of the Department's policy of acquiring information as to the raw material resources of the country. The mine is understood to be the property of a company, and it is not considered desirable to publish Reports on private undertakings of the kind.

Galway Land Grant Deductions.

MR. JOHN ROCHE (Galway, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the total amount of the loss charged on the county of Galway, and deducted from grants payable to the county council, under the Land Act of 1903; and if he can also give particulars as to how this sum is divided for arrears of annuity, unearned dividend and issue of stock, advanced dividend, interest due but not received and unproductive balances, respectively.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The total amount deducted under the Land Act of 1903 from the grants assigned to county Galway was £3,625, consisting of:—

	£
Arrears of Annuities -	304
Unearned dividend on issues of stock - -	1,274
Advance dividend - -	733
Interest due but not received - - -	832
Unproductive balances -	482

Land Purchase—Longford Case.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, if he will explain why the receivable order No. 56/1164 issued to Patrick Casey, Mullaghavourneen, Longford, has been retained by the Land Commission Office in Dublin and has not been returned to Casey, notwithstanding several applications by him; is he aware that in consequence of failure on his part to produce the receivable order his rent would not be taken in the bank, for which a process was then issued and costs put upon him; and will he now direct that this man's original receiving order be returned to him.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Land Commission inform me that on 10th May, 1906, Mr. Patrick Casey lodged his land purchase instalment due on the 1st of that month, and the receivable order was forthwith returned to him by post, duly receipted. Mr. Casey had not up to March last paid the instalment due on 1st November, 1906, for which a receivable order had been sent to him, and the Land Commission accordingly issued instructions that he should be sued for the amount. On 13th April Mr. Casey remitted the instalment direct to the Land Commission, but kept the receivable order. He has been requested to return the order, but so far has not done so.

Cavan Urban Council.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state when the Local Government Board first received the by-laws submitted by the Cavan Urban District Council since the passing of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898; will he say how many times since by-laws have been submitted by the Cavan Urban Council to the Local Government Board; and in what position the matter now stands.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) Three sets of by-laws relating to different matters were first submitted by the Cavan Urban District Council to the Local Government Board on 10th August, 1901. Three other sets of by-laws were submitted on 30th January, 1902, and another set on 21st July, 1904. I am forwarding to the hon. Member a statement showing the dates upon which the various steps in connection with these by-laws were taken, and the present position of the matter in each case.

Irish Poor Law Administration.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, when the Government intend to give effect, by legislation or otherwise, to the findings of the Committee appointed to inquire into the working of the Poor Law system of Ireland, whose Report is awaited with anxiety by the people of Ireland.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Report to which the hon. Member refers has been presented to Parliament. The Government deem it necessary to consider carefully the recommendations of the Commission as a whole before undertaking legislation to give effect to them. As I have already indicated, this will take a considerable time, and I do not, therefore, expect to be able in the near future to make any definite statement on the subject.

Rathkeale District Council.

MR. ARKWRIGHT (Hereford): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a memorial forwarded to the Local Government Board by forty-one ratepayers in the Lismakeery electoral division, charging the Rathkeale District Council with extravagance and corruption, and inviting the Local Government Board to dissolve the said district council, and to substitute paid guardians for that body; whether the sworn testimony upon which these charges are based has received attention; and what reply has been sent by the Local Government Board.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Local Government Board have received the memorial referred to, and, in accordance with their usual practice, have, as a preliminary measure, forwarded it to the rural district council for their observations. The Board have not yet received a reply from the council, but upon receiving it will consider what action should be taken. The Board, however, have no power to dissolve a rural district council as suggested by the memorialists. The second part of the Question appears to refer to an inquiry which was recently held as to the manner in which the council's engineer has discharged his duties under the council's last scheme. At this inquiry some general evidence was given regarding the complicity of councillors in the contracts for the scheme. This matter is also receiving consideration.

Irish Post Office Stores Branches.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): To ask the Postmaster-General whether, in view of the fact that the local post office store branches in Dublin, Belfast, and Cork, have been abolished, and a new central department created in Dublin to take their place, and that the Irish clerks in the former branches were informed they could not obtain appointments under the new departments, he will state how they have been provided for; and whether a portion of the staff has been imported.

(*Answered by Mr. Sydney Buxton.*) The formation of the new central stores branch in Dublin is still under consideration, and in the circumstances I am not yet in a position to state what the composition of the staff will be. As I said on the 18th April, in reply to the hon. Member for North Kilkenny, full regard will be had to the claims of the existing staff, and there is no question of dispensing with the services of any of them, or of reducing their pay.

Special Courts for Juvenile Offenders.

MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department with reference to the convictions of children in twenty-nine borough courts, whether he can state how many, and which, of the authorities hold special courts for the trial of youthful offenders; and whether he has any information with regard to the holding of such special courts in other urban areas or counties.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) Full information about the arrangements made for dealing with children's cases is given in the Return headed Treatment of Youthful Offenders, which was published in March last (H. C. 84).

Bishopstoke Church.

CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, when the new church at Bishopstoke, Hampshire, was substituted for the old it was legally consecrated; and, if not, whether he will take steps to have this done.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Gladstone.*) I am informed that, when the new church was substituted for the old, it had already been consecrated.

Dumbarton Church Dispute.

Mr. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): To ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware that the sum of £1,400, which Lord Overtoun along with Colonel Denny offered through the Churches Commission towards Free Church accommodation in Dumbarton, and to which the Commission proposed to give effect, is the proceeds of sale of an old Free Church property in Dumbarton, and that the property mentioned was left in trust, the proceeds from rent of same to be paid annually to the Minister of the Free Church in Dumbarton; and whether, in view of this fact, he will call the attention of the Churches Commission to this proposed diversion of a trust fund.

(*Answered by Mr. Sinclair.*) The Commission, I have no doubt, are fully informed upon this matter, but I shall be glad to lay before them the substance of the observations contained in the hon. Member's Question.

Saturday Half-Holidays for Civil Servants.

Mr. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that a weekly Saturday half-holiday is granted in the great majority of public offices, he will take steps to have the Order in Council so amended as to allow of a like privilege being granted in all Government offices.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) I am not aware that a weekly half-holiday is granted in the great majority of public offices, and I am not prepared to recommend any alterations in the Orders in Council dealing with this matter.

Irish Government Banking.

Sir THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will give the text of the Act of Parliament constituting the Bank of Ireland the Government banker in Ireland, and if he will state the date up to which this arrangement stands.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Section 10 of the Exchequer and Audit Departments Act, 1866, directs that the gross revenues shall be paid to accounts to be entitled "The Account of His Majesty's Exchequer" at the Bank of England and the Bank of Ireland, respectively, and that all other public moneys payable to the Exchequer shall be paid to the same accounts. The Bank of Ireland is thus constituted the Government Banker in Ireland, so far as the business of the Exchequer is concerned. The arrangement is not limited as to time. Various Acts relating to the National Debt provide for the Government stocks being transferable in the books of the Bank of Ireland, and for the dividends being paid at that bank. The National Debt Act, 1870, may be cited; and, as regards the particular case of Guaranteed 2¾ per cent. Stock, the Irish Land Act, 1903, Section 31. The Bank Act, 1892, fixes the rate of remuneration payable to the Bank of Ireland for management of the National Debt inscribed in its books. That rate was determined as the result of an inquiry which took into account the work done by the bank in management of the Public Accounts, as well as of the National Debt, and also the benefit to the bank of the use of Government balances. The Act continues in force the rate so fixed up to 31st March, 1912.

Customs Promotions.

Mr. CLELAND: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury how many cases of special promotion have occurred in the Customs Department since the date of the Treasury Minute of 31st March, 1891, and in what numbers and to what rank respectively, were the promotions made; and whether the conditions laid down in the Treasury Minute with regard to special promotion have been observed in all cases.

(*Answered by Mr. Runciman.*) Speaking generally, all appointments in the direct line of promotion in the Custom service since 1891 have been made by merit and seniority combined, the degree of merit required increasing in accordance with the importance of the position to be filled. This is in accordance with the general rules laid down for the outdoor establishment in the Goschen Minute of 1891. If the hon. Member has any special class or individual in view, and would care to communicate with the Commissioners of Customs, they will be happy to give any further explanations he may desire, either in writing or verbally.

Unfunded Debt.

MR. ASHTON (Bedfordshire, Luton): To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the present amount of the unfunded debt; of what issues does it consist; and what were the issues of the unfunded debt at the same time last year.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The unfunded debt at the present date amounts to £50,674,500; on the 6th May last year it amounted to £62,713,000, made up as follows:—

	6th May, 1906.	6th May, 1907.
	£	£
Treasury bills -	17,213,000	10,713,000
Exchequer bonds	15,500,000	9,961,500
War stock and War bonds -	30,000,000	30,000,000
	62,713,000	50,674,500

Irish Government Bank Deposits.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if, in view of the advantage derived from the arrangement made by his predecessor for the payment of interest on the credit balances and deposits of Irish Government Departments in Ireland, he will arrange for the payment by the Bank of England of interest on all moneys due to or coming from Ireland from the 31st March last.

(*Answered by Mr. Asquith.*) The circumstances of the two banks are not the same. The Bank of Ireland, as I understand, allows deposit interest on other accounts, and was able therefore to extend the same treatment to certain Government accounts without an infraction of its rules. The Bank of England never allows interest on deposits.

The Chief of Aundh.

MR. HART-DAVIES (Hackney, N.): To ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Chief of Aundh, now under trial on charges preferred against him by the political agent, before a Commission composed of ten European members of the Civil Service, has appealed to the Government to appoint another ruling chief on the Commission in the place of the Chief of Bhor, who has resigned; and, if so, what answer has been returned to his appeal; and whether he will take steps to secure that some Indian chief, or, at all events, some Indian gentleman of good position, should be added to the Commission should the accused desire it.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Commission appointed to try the Chief of Aundh on a charge of instigating one Perga Manga to collect men and, with their aid, to commit a dacoity in the Kharbari's house and to murder him, consisted of two European members of the Indian Civil Service, Messrs. Logan and Kincaid and the Chief of Bhor. The Chief of Bhor having withdrawn from the Commission on the day before that fixed for the sittings to commence, the Bombay Government declined to entertain a request from the Chief of Aundh for the appointment of another chief, owing to the difficulty of finding an Indian of suitable rank willing to accept the invidious responsibility of sitting on a Commission of the kind, and to the grave inconvenience that would be caused by a postponement of the hearing at such short notice. The Commission completed its sittings on the 4th instant. I see no reason in the report which has been furnished me by telegraph for the Government of Bombay to interfere with their discretion in the matter. Aundh is a petty Satara Jaghirdar with an area of 447 square miles.

Madras Landed Estates Bill.

MR. REES: To ask the Secretary of State for India whether, among the zemindaris affected by the Madras Landed Estates Bill are included any in respect of which the Court of Wards occupies a fiduciary position; whether such court is, in fact, officially subordinate to the Madras Government; if so, whether minors seized of such estates are sufficiently represented in regard to interests which may be, and which, it is asserted, are prejudicially affected by the Bill now before the Legislative Council of the said Government; and, whether, in these circumstances, he will arrange that such minors, if any, shall receive separate and independent representation during the passage of the said Bill through the Legislative Council of the said Government.

(*Answered by Mr. Secretary Morley.*) The Madras Estates Land Bill purports to declare and determine the conditions of tenancy in permanently settled estates in the Madras Presidency. It is of general application to all such estates, whether they are for the time being under the management of the proprietors themselves or under that of the Court of Wards. The interests of minors are not exceptionally affected so as to require separate representation on the legislative council. Permanently settled proprietors are already represented on the council. I do not propose to take any action in the matter.

Irish Education Fines.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland by what authority has a circular been issued to magistrates adjudicating at Petty Sessions directing them to allow only a fraction of the fines imposed on defaulters under the Irish Education Act to the relief of the local authority, and not the whole fine as directed by Section 3 of the Act.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The circular in question, which calls attention to the law as to the disposal of fines under the Irish Education Act, 1892, was issued by the Registry of Petty Sessions Clerks. For full particulars I beg to refer to my Answer to the Question of the hon. Member for Carlow on 18th March.†

Caldbeck Estate, Queen's County.

MR. DELANY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what causes the delay in the sale of the Caldbeck estate, Ballacolla, Queen's County; and, in view of the fact that the agreements were signed so far back as December, 1904, and that four inspectors have since visited the property, will he see that steps are taken to expedite the sale.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are now in a position to make a formal proposal for the purchase of the estate referred to, and they hope to transmit their offer to the owner in the course of a few days.

Irish National School Inspections.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether national school teachers are allowed by the Commissioners of National Education to appeal against an inspection; and if he can state now how many applications for re-inspection were received during the past year, and how many re-inspections were ordered by the Commissioners.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Commissioners of National Education inform me that, under their regulations, any teacher who feels aggrieved by the conduct of the inspector can appeal through the manager to the Commissioners. When such an appeal is made, the Commissioners carefully consider all the circumstances of the case, and, if they deem it necessary, they instruct one of the senior or chief inspectors to visit the school and make a special report. The Commissioners are unable to say how many applications for re-inspection were received from teachers during the past year. In order to do so a close scrutiny of all the letters received from teachers would be necessary. The Commissioners, however, are prepared to report upon any specific case which the hon. Member may have in view.

Kenmare's Evicted Tenant.

MR. MURPHY: To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the case of Mr. Daniel O'Shea, an evicted tenant on the estate of Lord Kenmare, county Kerry, the Estates Commissioners are aware of the last offer on the part of the landlord as to reinstatement; and whether the Commissioners can now reopen negotiations to enable Mr. O'Shea to be put back in his farm, which is unoccupied.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxi., 443.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners have inquired into this case, and as a result have intimated to the owner's agent the amount which they are prepared to advance for the purchase of the holding. The Commissioners have not yet heard whether the landlord is prepared to accept the offer.

De Montalt Estate, Dundrum.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): To ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Estates Commissioners have purchased the untenanted lands on the De Montalt estate, Dundrum, county Tipperary; if applications for the lands received from evicted tenants in the immediate district, in deference to the public opinion of the locality, will have priority over claimants from other parts of the country, and whether the Commissioners, in order to avoid anything in the nature of friction, will reinstate the evicted tenants of county Tipperary to any lands in their possession before introducing applicants from other counties.

(*Answered by Mr. Birrell.*) The Estates Commissioners are negotiating for the purchase of this estate under Section 6 of the Act of 1903. In the event of their acquiring the property they will, when disposing of the untenanted land, give prior consideration to the applications of evicted tenants resident in the neighbourhood.

QUESTIONS IN THE HOUSE.

"The Mikado."

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether naval bands have been forbidden to play any selections from "The Mikado"; and, if so, will he explain the reason for this prohibition.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON, Dundee): The license for the play was withdrawn by the Lord Chamberlain, who asked that instructions should be given to all naval and marine bands to exclude from their musical programmes any music of "The Mikado" during the visit of His Imperial Highness the Prince Fushimi of Japan to this country.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR (Sussex, Horsham): Can the right hon. Gentleman state more fully the grounds on which the Admiralty came to this extraordinary decision?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I have stated fully the grounds.

MR. GEORGE FABER (York): May I ask whether there is any buffoonery in the music?

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY (St. Andrews Burghs): Will the Government reconsider their decision?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Admiralty are alone concerned in this matter, and they will not reconsider their decision.

Stores for the Australian Squadron.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if Australian tenders for the supply of stores required for the Australian squadron will be accepted; and if sufficient time will be given to those desiring to tender in Australia so that they may have a proper chance of competing with tenders from England.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: In the case of provisions, coals, and other commodities produced in or largely imported into Australia, a large proportion of the stores required for the Australian squadron are obtained under contracts made on the station with local firms. Other descriptions of stores not produced in or imported to any considerable extent into Australia are sent out from England; there would be no object in asking Australian firms to tender for these. From time to time as new trades develop in Australia, the list of stores purchased locally is revised.

Government Contract Specifications.

MR. HUNT (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the fact that

Sir John Jackson, the Government contractor for the works at Keyham Harbour, wrote on the 1st of January, 1906, to the effect that under present changed conditions Government contractors for the Admiralty would now be able to buy chains, anchors, fittings, screws, engines, machinery, furniture, ropes, and a hundred and one things for making warships from foreign countries made by foreign workmen, he will say whether any other articles, as well as stone for British dockyards, can be used by contractors to the Admiralty for anything connected with the British Navy which are not of British manufacture and material; and whether contractors are allowed to sub-let their contracts; and, if so, what conditions are made to prevent the sub-contractors from using anything except British material manufactured by British workmen.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: No such letter appears to have reached the Admiralty so far as I can ascertain. If the hon. Member will furnish me with a copy I will give it my attention.

MR. HUNT: Does the right hon. Gentleman dispute the fact of the letter having been written?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I have never seen the letter and cannot dispute it, but if the hon. Member will send me a copy I will give it my best attention.

New Cavalry Sword.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the pattern of the new cavalry sword has yet been decided on.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. HALDANE, Haddingtonshire): No decision has as yet been reached. A number of the swords of the pattern recommended will, it is hoped, shortly be in the hands of the troops for trial.

MR. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool): How long has the subject been under discussion, and when may a decision be expected?

MR. HALDANE was understood to reply that the swords would be issued in about a week's time.

Cavalry for Scotland.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now make any statement with regard to allocating a brigade of three cavalry regiments or any other force of regular cavalry to Scotland.

MR. HALDANE: No decision has yet been arrived at.

New Bayonet.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the pattern for the new bayonet to be issued to the troops has yet been decided on.

MR. HALDANE: The reply is in the negative. Patterns of new bayonets are still being tried by the troops, and it is hoped that reports will shortly be received.

Camp and Messing Allowances.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the messing and camp allowance of 1s. a day per man, to be granted to the commanding officer of a battalion of Territorial Infantry when in camp, will be expended at the discretion of the commanding officer; or whether this grant will be subject to regulations made by the Army Council as to the manner of its use.

MR. HALDANE: The messing and camp allowance will be paid to the commanding officer, to be expended by him for the benefit of the corps. Regulations regarding its issue will be formulated in due course.

Soldiers' Walking-out Uniform.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the clothing provided for the territorial soldier at the public cost will include a walking-out uniform.

MR. HALDANE: The question is under consideration.

Lance-Corporals.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether separation allowance will be given to lance-corporals of the Territorial Army when in camp.

MR. HALDANE: If it be found necessary to create lance appointments, the lance corporal, being a non-commissioned officer, will be entitled to separation allowance on the same terms as other non-commissioned officers.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: Is the indecision due to any doubt if there will be lance appointments?

MR. HALDANE: That is one of the points under consideration.

MR. ASHLEY: Who will decide it—the Army Council or the commanding officers?

MR. HALDANE: The Army Council.

Military Expenditure.

MR. VERNEY (Buckinghamshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what was the increase on military and naval expenditure in 1904 compared with that in 1894, including revenue intercepted and not paid into the Exchequer.

MR. HALDANE: The gross Army expenditure in the financial years 1894–5 and 1904–5, inclusive of loan expenditure and without deducting appropriation in aid was as follows:—1894-5; £21,352,560; 1904–5, £36,478,082; showing an increase of £15,125,522. As regards the naval expenditure I must ask my hon. friend to refer to my right hon. friend for the figures.

MR. VERNEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what has been the increase or decrease on military and naval expenditure in the year 1905 and in 1906 compared with the expenditure in 1904, taking into account expenditure out of revenue intercepted and not paid into the Exchequer.

MR. HALDANE: The gross Army expenditure in the financial years 1903–4, 1904–5, and 1905–6, inclusive of Military Works Loan Expenditure and without deducting appropriation in aid, was as follows:—1903–4, £46,698,020; 1904–5, £36,478,082; 1905–6, £33,331,226, showing decreases as compared with 1903–4 of £10,219,938 in 1904–5, and of £13,366,794 in 1905–6. The figures for 1906–7 are not yet available. As regards the naval expenditure, I must ask my hon. friend to refer to my right hon. friend for the figures.

Engineering Staff.

MR. J. M. ROBERTSON (Northumberland, Tyneside): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any arrangements have yet been made to improve the position of surveyors and assistant surveyors of the staff for engineer services as regards pay and promotion, travelling allowances, and compensation for removals.

MR. HALDANE: The whole question is still under consideration.

Regimental Adjutants.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what will be the approximate estimated increase in cost by retaining regimental adjutants belonging to the Regular Forces for the Territorial Force, as compared with the approximate estimate for regimental adjutants contained in Army Paper [Cd. 3296].

MR. HALDANE: If all the adjutants for the Territorial Force included in Paper [Cd. 3296] were regular officers the increase of cost including non-effective charges would be about £140,000.

Army Nomenclature.

SIR C. HILL (Shrewsbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the existing titles of Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers will be retained when the force contemplated under the Territorial Forces Bill has been constituted.

MR. HALDANE: The question of the nomenclature of the units of the Territorial Forces has not yet been settled.

Camp Messing Allowances.

MR. ASHLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what will be the resulting cost to the State of the proposed messing allowance to men of the Territorial Force if the whole force should go into camp for fifteen days annually, as compared with the sum estimated for in Army Paper [Cd. 3296].

Mr. HALDANE: If the whole force given in Paper Cd. 3296 were to go into Camp for 15 days, the excess cost would be about £170,000 a year.

Mr. LEE (Hants, Fareham): Does not the right hon. Gentleman anticipate that the Territorial Army will go into camp for more than the minimum period?

Mr. HALDANE: I do not estimate anything of the sort. £170,000 is the excess cost if the men go into camp for the fifteen days.

Piershill and Maryhill Barracks.

Mr. MITCHELL-THOMSON (Lanarkshire, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when the Scots Greys will leave Piershill and Maryhill Barracks.

Mr. HALDANE: The regiment will leave these barracks about 22nd May. Part of the regiment will go to take part in the manœuvres.

Mr. WATT (Glasgow, College): Will another regiment of cavalry be sent to Maryhill Barracks?

Mr. HALDANE: I should think not.

The County Associations and the Reduction of the Auxiliary Forces.

Major ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if, in view of the fact that the responsibility for reducing the Auxiliary Forces by some 74,000 men will fall upon the county associations, he can arrange to inform those associations, at an early date, what the probable requirements for each locality will be, in order that the necessary reductions may take place partly by stopping recruiting forthwith, in order to reduce to a minimum the number of units which will have to be ultimately disbanded and the number of individual men who will have to be dismissed.

Mr. HALDANE: As I have already indicated to the House, the introduction of the measures contemplated in the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill can only be very gradual, and every association will be given ample time to conform the organisation of the forces in its area to the General Staff scheme. I must not be taken to agree with the hon. and gallant Member in his description of the character of the reorganisation.

Work for Woolwich.

Mr. BELLAIRS (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any orders for war material for the Army or Navy hitherto intended for the private establishments have been diverted to Woolwich in order to arrest discharges of men; and whether a large order for lyddite shell has recently been placed with Woolwich.

Mr. HALDANE: With regard to most of the stores required by the Army and Navy no fixed proportion for dividing orders between the Ordnance Factories and the private trade has ever been laid down, and the allocation is determined year by year as appears best in accordance with the public interests. Where a definite proportion has been laid down in the past, it has not been departed from on the present occasion. The bulk of the orders for lyddite shell are allotted this year to the Ordnance Factories, but on some other descriptions of shell the greater share will almost certainly go to the private trade.

Mr. BELLAIRS: Have the Admiralty been asked to give to Woolwich orders intended for private firms?

Mr. HALDANE: There have been negotiations with the Admiralty with a view to getting as much work as possible for Woolwich.

Lyddite Shell Manufacture at Woolwich.

Mr. BELLAIRS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a large number of lyddite shell, under recent orders given to Woolwich, were rejected; and, if so, what percentage of the number under examination at the time.

Mr. HALDANE: Some 12 pr. lyddite shells made in the Ordnance Factories have recently been rejected for flaws due to defects in material supplied by the trade. The examination and investigation are, however, not yet completed.

Mr. BELLAIRS: What was the proportion rejected?

MR. HALDANE: I cannot say offhand.

The Rioting at Rawalpindi.

*MR. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) asked the Secretary of State for India whether he could give the House any information regarding the riot reported from Rawalpindi; whether the disturbance was connected with the prosecution of the proprietor and editor of the *Punjabi* newspaper, who made a false charge of murder against an innocent Englishman, and sentences were passed by the local magistrate, against the alleged severity of which complaints were made in Questions by certain Members of this House; whether such sentences had been subsequently reduced, and, if so, to what extent upon appeal; whether the final Court of Appeal had adjudicated upon this case, and, if so, with what result; and whether the Government of India had expressed any intention of taking measures to suppress sedition, which was being fomented by agitators in the Punjaub and elsewhere in India.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Mr. MORLEY, Montrose Burghs) said that the Answer to the first Question was in the negative; there was no reason to associate the one with the other. The duration of the sentences had been reduced on appeal; but the last Question of the hon. Member was wholly superfluous and required no Answer whatever.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was still sceptical as to there being any unrest in India.

SIR H. COTTON (Nottingham, E.) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman could make a statement for the information of the House as to the circumstances which had led to the recent disturbance at Rawalpindi.

MR. MORLEY: I think the House will desire the latest information I have regarding these occurrences. I have received a telegram, which was sent from Simla on 5th May, and reached the India Office last night, from the Viceroy, which states that "On 21st April a meeting was held at Rawalpindi, said to have been attended by 8,000 or 10,000 men. A well-known pleader presided, and another pleader spoke on the subject of increased land revenue and the prosecution of the *Punjabi* newspaper." Perhaps I was wrong in saying that there was no connection between these disturbances and the prosecution, but it is the opinion of the Government of India that there is no connection. One speaker said the people of the Punjaub must be prepared to sacrifice their lives for the Motherland. Those who were afraid of bloodshed had better go home. Petitions to the British King were useless. The Punjabis had helped to put down the Mutiny; they were now ill-treated, and were suffering for their base treachery to their own countrymen. Now was the time to resist, and not to be afraid of Martinis and howitzers. The people would withhold payment of the increased land revenue. Another speaker protested against increased land revenue, water rates and forced labour. In consequence of this, the Deputy Commissioner sent notice to the three speakers who took part in the meeting to attend his Court, for the purpose of a public inquiry into the question whether they should be prosecuted for sedition, and have their licences for practice withdrawn. A crowd of students, traders, and shopkeepers assembled at the Court to express sympathy with the pleaders, and were apparently disappointed when informed that the inquiry would not be held. Then followed disturbances. The three pleaders have since been arrested, presumably for abetting the recent disturbances, and have applied to the Chief Court for bail." The telegram adds that the General Officer Commanding has telegraphed that all is now quiet, but that he anticipated further rioting if the Chief Court grants bail. I understand that bail has not been granted. The Government of India do not at present apprehend further rioting, and, of course, the House is well aware that Rawalpindi is one of the strongest garrisons in India.

*CAPTAIN FABER (Hampshire, Andover): Was the rioting the result of a feud between Mohammedans and Hindus, or was it solely directed against Europeans?

MR. MORLEY: I think I must have notice of any further Questions.

Case of Captain Grogan.

Mr. SMEATON (Stirlingshire): On behalf of the hon. Member for Roxburghshire, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the person called Captain Grogan, at Nairobi, holds any military or naval commission from the Crown; whether he is a Justice of the Peace and a visitor of the gaol at Nairobi; and whether, after the conviction and sentence of imprisonment passed upon him for unlawful flogging of native subjects of the King, he will be continued in such offices.

The UNDER-SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. Churchill, Manchester, N.W.): Captain Grogan does not now hold any military or naval commission from the Crown; but he is entitled to describe himself as Captain, as he was granted the honorary rank of Captain in the Army in virtue of his having served as a Captain in an embodied Militia battalion. He is a visiting Justice of Nairobi Gaol, but does not, so far as the Secretary of State is aware, possess any of the other powers belonging to a Justice of the Peace in this country. He will not be continued in the office of visiting Justice.

Mr. SMEATON: On behalf of the hon. Member for Roxburghshire, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the criminal codes in force at Nairobi contain any provision similar to Section 545 of the Indian Code of Criminal Procedure, whereby a Court passing judgment of fine may order the whole or any part of the fine recovered to be applied to defray the costs of the prosecution and in compensation for the injury caused by the offence committed, where substantial compensation is, in the opinion of the Court, recoverable by civil suit; and whether the magistrate at Nairobi who sentenced Captain Grogan and others to fines for unlawful floggings of native subjects of the King did award any compensation to any of the native subjects flogged.

Mr. CHURCHILL: The offence for which Captain Grogan and others have recently been sentenced to fine and imprisonment is that of unlawful assembly, so that the provisions of Section 545 of the Code of Criminal Procedure are not applicable, since a civil action could not be brought to recover compensation for unlawful assembly.

Mr. J. WARD (Stoke-on-Trent): Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the last part of the Question?

Mr. CHURCHILL: I do not think compensation can be awarded. At any rate it is not usual for the Crown to award it in such cases.

Mr. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): What remedy or redress have the natives then?

Mr. CHURCHILL: The remedies the law allows.

Dinizulu's Libel Action.

Mr. J. M. ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is yet in a position to state the facts as to the alleged interference of the Natal Government in the action for libel brought by the chief Dinizulu against his former private secretary.

Mr. CHURCHILL: No, Sir.

Repatriation of Chinese Coolies.

Viscount TURNOUR: On behalf of the hon. Member for the Hoxton Division for Shoreditch, I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies what was the total number of Chinese coolies repatriated during the last financial year at the expense of the Home Government; and if any portion of the grant voted for that purpose remains unexpended.

Mr. CHURCHILL: Seven hundred and sixty-six coolies were repatriated at the expense of His Majesty's Government during the last financial year. The whole of the grant voted by Parliament for that purpose has been paid out of the Exchequer, but the final accounts of actual expenditure have not yet been received from the Transvaal.

Sir GILBERT PARKER (Gravesend): Is the cost of the repatriation now paid by the Government?

Mr. CHURCHILL: That matter hardly arises out of the Question on the Paper. The conditions of repatriation were laid down by the Government during the period they were responsible for the Government of the Transvaal, and the work is still proceeding under those regulations. No decision has yet been come to with regard to the present responsibility for the cost, but I hope one will be arrived at in the course of a week.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.): Were these coolies repatriated, or any of them, because they considered that the terms of service imposed on them amounted to slavery?

MR. CHURCHILL: Evidently they did not consider the conditions sufficiently attractive to induce them to stay longer.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: How much money did these coolies take back with them to China?

MR. CHURCHILL: It could not have been much, because one of the conditions of repatriation is that they have not sufficient funds to pay the cost of their return.

VISCOUNT HELMSLEY (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies if any Chinese coolies will be repatriated during the present financial year at the expense of the Home Government.

MR. CHURCHILL: The matter is now under discussion and no decision has yet been reached.

Admission of Unlicensed Coolies into the Transvaal.

MR. J. WARD: I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can give the name of the mine where the 295 Chinese coolies are working in the Transvaal for whom no licences were issued at the time of landing in South Africa; whether any application has been made to the responsible authorities for such additional licences to be issued; and what action, if any, has been taken in the matter.

The following Questions on the same subject also appeared on the Paper—

MR. G. GREENWOOD (Peterborough): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies how many Chinese coolies have been imported into South Africa without licences; whether any of them, and, if so, how many, formed part of those imported by the steamship "Cranley," which left Chingwang-tao on 27th November last; and whether, in view of the assurance given by him on 10th December last that if it should appear that any of such coolies were not covered by licences, steps would be taken to prevent their landing, he can say why such steps were not in fact taken and by whose authority they were allowed to land.

MR. SCOTT (Ashton-under-Lyne): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies on whom should the cost of repatriating the 257 Chinese coolies landed in South Africa without licence fall; and have those responsible been asked to pay for sending them back.

MR. SCOTT: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when did Lord Selborne become aware of the fact that 257 Chinese coolies had arrived in South Africa without licence; was it with Lord Selborne's consent that the coolies were permitted to start work; and, if not, what steps did Lord Selborne take to see that the law was complied with.

MR. WALSH (Lancashire, Ince): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies when the Colonial Office first became aware of the illegal importation of the 259 Chinese coolies; whether these coolies are now receiving any different treatment from the others and whether licences have been issued in respect to them, and in what way has their presence in the Transvaal been made legal; whether these coolies are employed at one mine or at several; and whether he can give to the House the name of the mine or mines, together with their proprietors; and whether he can state who is the official responsible for the error in calculation by which these coolies were allowed to be shipped from China.

DR. RUTHERFORD (Middlesex, Brentford): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any communication was made by Lord Selborne to the new Government of the Transvaal that there was a large number of Chinese coolies who had been imported into the Colony without licenses; and, if so, what steps were taken by the Colonial Government to deal with the situation.

Mr. BYLES (Salford, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the error in issuing, under the Transvaal Chinese Labour Ordinance, 259 licences for coolies in excess of the total number authorised, did not arise before the present Government took office; did it not remain undiscovered until some time after His Majesty's present Secretary of State was appointed; and what punishment, if any, will fall on the officer primarily responsible for this irregularity.

Mr. STEWART (Greenock): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Chinese coolies who have been imported into the Transvaal without licences are at liberty to trade and acquire land; whether they are bound to reside on the premises of their employers; and, if so, whether they require any permit to lease the premises; and whether there is any law imposing the necessity of such a permit.

Mr. NICHOLLS (Northamptonshire, N.): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether persons who introduce and employ Chinese labourers in the Transvaal without having obtained licences for them are liable to a penalty of £100 for each labourer; and, if so, whether the introducers and employers of the 259 coolies recently imported without licences have been made amenable to the law.

Mr. NICHOLLS: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Chinese coolies who have been imported into the Transvaal without the licences required by the Labour Ordinance are subject to the restraints upon liberty, and upon the rights to acquire property, which are imposed by that Ordinance.

Mr. MACKARNESS (Berkshire, Newbury): To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the 257 Chinese labourers recently imported into the Transvaal without the licences required by law are at present confined in compounds; and, if so, in which mines and by what law or authority they are so confined.

Mr. MACKARNESS: To ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies who were the officials responsible for the recent importation into the Transvaal of 257 Chinese labourers not licensed, as required by the Labour Ordinance of 1904; and whether they have offered any explanation for permitting such a breach of the law.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I think it will be for the convenience of the House if I answer this and the other Questions on the subject by reading the telegrams which have passed between the Secretary of State and the High Commissioner. The number of Chinese coolies imported in S.S. "Cranley" appearing, according to the information in Colonial Office, to be somewhat in excess of the licences issued, Lord Elgin telegraphed on 27th December as follows: "It is difficult to reconcile statistics of Chinese coolies introduced since December, 1905, with number of licences then outstanding. I should be glad if you would send home by mail full report on the figures." The High Commissioner replied on 1st January: "1st January. Your telegram of 27th December No. 1. Matter has been referred to Jamieson, who, on again going through figures, has discovered that he unwittingly furnished me with incorrect data for my telegram 15th December, No. 1. That he should have done so is due to a series of unfortunate clerical errors for which he assumes full responsibility, I, of course, having nothing but his figures on which to go. He puts forward in part explanation of how mistakes arose the fact that the principal clerk in charge of returns was on leave and the figures were only checked by one, and that an inadequate method. The sole official record of the number of coolies in respect of whom licences are issued is the counterfoils of the licence-book, and according to these counterfoils, licences in respect of a total number of 63,350 coolies were issued, exclusive of 3,000 applied for by the Randfontein group, which hereafter will be assumed to be permanently eliminated. In the process of investigation it was accidentally discovered that one licence and one counterfoil made out in June, 1905, were incorrectly filled in, the number on both appearing as 553 instead of 246 as it ought to have been. Prior to signature the licence was altered, but not the counterfoil, and the latter, as explained, constituting the only record in the Foreign Labour Department, 553 was, throughout all previous computations, assumed to be correct. It was only when the figures furnished in my telegram of 15th December were being compiled that this discrepancy was discovered, and the total set down at its correct amount, namely, 63,043. The true position therefore is as follows: actual number of licences issued 63,043, actual and prospective arrivals, 63,302, difference 259. Had the figure 553 on the counterfoil been correct, number of licences issued stood at 63,350, leaving a balance of licences over coolies of forty-eight, so that, in so far as the licences are concerned under which the coolies brought in since December, 1905, were introduced, no infraction of the stipulation laid down by His Majesty's Government could be assumed to have been committed. The one satisfactory feature of this blunder is that the fundamental error has been traced back to June, 1905, and that it was not discovered until last batch of coolies were on the water, thus making it impossible even for a hostile critic to suggest that error was anything but a pure accident. I have taken serious notice of the blunder, but am prepared to stand bail for the absolute loyalty of Jamieson and his staff." On this the Secretary of State telegraphed as follows:—"7th January. Matter most urgent. Your telegram 1st January, No. 3. In view of pledges given in House of Commons that no Chinaman not covered by licences should land in South Africa, it is desirable that the 259 arriving in excess of the number for whom licences were authorised should be returned to China. Please telegraph your views as to how repatriation could be effected and as to incidence of cost and of liability to compensate those who do not return willingly. Even if error was itself accidental the direct cause is negligence of Superintendent in relying on so manifestly insufficient a record as counterfoils of licence book." To which High Commissioner replied:—"10th January. Matter most urgent. Your telegram No. 2, 7th January. I do not think that any incident of my administration has caused me more annoyance or regret than this unfortunate blunder made by my officers so long ago as 10th June, 1905, and which is producing its consequences now. It was a perfectly *bona fide* slip, such as all men are liable to. The Labour Importation Agency acting equally *bona fide* on mistaken information supplied by the Foreign Labour Department, cannot reasonably be made to share responsibility. I quite understand that His Majesty's Government consider it very desirable that, in view of pledges given, 259 men of the new arrivals should not have licences issued to them or be allowed to proceed to the Rand, but I am most grateful for being allowed to state extraordinary difficulty of Transvaal Government in the matter. If I am compelled to send back 259 of the coolies who have just arrived by the "Cranley," and are now in the depot at Durban, and my officers succeed in explaining position to them without producing a riot, whole expense will have to fall on Transvaal Government, and from the point of view of the Transvaal tax-payer Government's position will be indefensible. Government will have to pay to the Labour Importation Agency same sum for each of the 259 as is charged to His Majesty's Government with respect to state-aided repatriates, namely, £25 per head. We must also pay coolies reasonable compensation for loss of advantages they expect under their contract. I put this at £20 a head, being very least sum which Jamieson estimates that a reasonably hard working and economical coolie could save in the three years for which these men think they have come. Total £11,655, or say £12,000. This is an estimate of minimum sum on which, in opinion of Superintendent of foreign labour, he can hope to persuade the men to return willingly. He says that none of them will return willingly without it. Says that it is more than possible that when they appreciate position they will stand out for more liberal compensation for breach of contract than £20 a head. We shall thus be involved in an absolute waste of public money to the extent of £12,000 at a moment when Government is in sore straits for money (and) is obliged to starve most necessary works in an effort to hand over the administration to the new Government without a deficit on the Budget, in spite of the very serious falling off in the revenue. For instance, a programme of new school buildings urgently required to replace existing insanitary accommodation has had to be postponed, and it is pointed out to me that, merely on account of a clerical error, Government will have to throw away a sum which would provide school accommodation for 800 children. I would remind you that total number of licences which have been issued is 63,043, and total number of coolies in the country, including all those brought by the "Cranley," is only 55,018, the difference being accounted for by the number who have been repatriated in one way or another, or who have died. I am not in any degree whatever responsible for what has happened, though I wish no one else to share with me responsibility for its consequences. I can only say that if His Majesty's Government can spare me this additional strain on Transvaal finances at a moment to me of extreme administrative difficulty, and allow me to pass this extra 259 men into the Transvaal, I shall be sincerely grateful." And the Secretary of State answered:—"17th January. Your telegram of 10th January, No. 4. I accept your assurance that what has occurred has been the result of a pure error, and that no suspicion of bad faith attaches to any one. But where a distinct pledge has been given to Parliament it is important to render it impossible that we should be charged, even unjustly, with having broken it in letter or spirit. For this reason I should have been glad to arrange for the immediate repatriation of so many coolies as have been imported in excess of the number of licences issued. But I appreciate the force of the considerations which you urge, and I am reluctant to incur the risks to which you refer, and especially on the eve of responsible government to impose an expenditure of £12,000 on the Transvaal as a consequence of the clerical error of an official, which took place before I assumed office. I will therefore not press further for repatriation of these coolies." As to the *status* of the 259 extra coolies, I do not know which ones they are nor upon which mines they are employed, nor how they should be distinguished among the total number imported. If the last 259 recruited were chosen, which seems the only possible way, reference would have to be made to China. So far as I am advised the mistake about the licences does not appear to affect the position of the labourer, who, when he is within the Transvaal, is subject to the provisions of the Labour Importation Ordinance. Moreover, all these matters have now passed in their administrative aspect wholly within the authority of the responsible Government of the Transvaal, and any legal issues which may arise out of them can only be determined by the Courts of that Colony.

Mr. J. WARD: I should like to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman intends to distribute that Answer.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I think it will be convenient to lay the full text of the telegrams I have read in the form of a Parliamentary Paper.

Major SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby): Since I was the hon. Member to whom the pledge was given that, if any coolies in excess of the number of licences issued were found to have embarked on this steamer, they should be returned, may I ask my right hon. friend whether he does not consider that any statement that the matter is now within the province of the Transvaal Government is quite beside the mark so far as this House is concerned, and whether the return of these 259 coolies is not a duty laid on His Majesty's Government which they cannot possibly evade? Further, I desire to ask whether it is possible for these coolies to be repatriated under the Repatriation Ordinance and out of the funds so provided.

Mr. CHURCHILL: I do not think that my hon. friend, having heard the telegrams, will suggest that we have not taken in a very serious spirit any pledge given to the House of Commons. But in carrying out such a pledge we must be guided by practical and reasonable considerations, and the proportion between the theoretic issue involved and the great practical difficulties must always be observed. As to what we can do now in regard to any matters connected with the Transvaal, I speak on an entirely different footing from that on which I spoke before the Constitution was granted.

We shall be guided largely by the responsible Ministers of the Transvaal.

MR. BYLES asked what punishment would be inflicted on the officer primarily responsible.

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not know who the officer in question is. He is very likely some not very exalted official in the Labour Importation Agency or the Foreign Labour Department. He has evidently been very severely censured by his superiors, and I do not think we should be adopting a very wise course if we were to proceed further against this unfortunate official.

MR. CROOKS (Woolwich): Is this a patronage appointment of the late Government?

MR. AUSTIN TAYLOR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): Were the coolies imported in excess of the numbers appearing on the licence or on the counterfoil?

MR. CHURCHILL: More coolies were imported than appeared on the counterfoil.

MR. LUPTON (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): Is it not a fact that the only officer responsible to the Colonial Office is the High Commissioner?

MR. J. WARD: I should like to ask whether it is to be understood that Lord Selborne or those responsible for the administration of public affairs in the Transvaal have issued these 259 licences since January of this year.

MR. CHURCHILL: The question is one of extreme complication, because no one can tell who are these particular 259 coolies. If you really wish to be quite just on the particular importer you ought to make a *pro rata* deduction from all the shiploads since the date when the error was made. In a matter so complicated I should hesitate to lay down the law without notice in answer to a supplementary Question. I must have an opportunity of consulting legal advisers. For anything done by Lord Selborne in this matter His Majesty's Government accept full responsibility.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester): Why have the Government kept this information so long from the House?

MR. CHURCHILL: No information was retained from the House, and it is always my endeavour to supply the House with the fullest information whenever I am interrogated; but I am not aware that it is my duty to endeavour to multiply opportunities for interrogation.

British Settlers in the Orange River Colony.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid.): I beg to ask the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the position of many of the British settlers in the Orange River Colony is precarious, owing to the excessive amounts they have to pay for redemption and interest; whether they have applied for a revaluation of their farms; and, if so, whether the Government will consent to the appointment of a commission of farmers and business men to inquire into the position of these settlers.

MR. CHURCHILL: I am aware that some of the settlers have applied for a revaluation; but I am not prepared to admit that the situation of many of them is precarious. The Government of the Orange River Colony have the interests of the settlers greatly at heart, and it does not appear that there would be any advantage in appointing a commission of inquiry.

SIR GILBERT PARKER: Is it the intention of the Government to consider the question of a revaluation of these lands?

MR. CHURCHILL: I do not know if that forms part of the scheme which is being promoted.

Mr. Abbott's Ransom from Turkish Brigands.

MR. BYLES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has the £15,000 recently paid to Turkish brigands for the ransom of Mr. Abbott at Salonica been found by the British Government; and will he say on what Vote the money will be asked for from the House of Commons.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. RUNCIMAN, Dewsbury; for Sir EDWARD GREY): The sum in question was advanced by His Majesty's Government, but will ultimately be required from the Ottoman Government, whom they hold responsible for the occurrence. It is not, therefore, proposed to submit any Vote for this service to the House of Commons.

MR. BYLES: Have you applied for it to the Ottoman Government?

MR. RUNCIMAN: Yes.

MR. BYLES: The question is are you likely to get it?

[No Answer was returned.]

Albanian Outrage at Uskub.

MAJOR ANSTRUTHER-GRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any official information showing that Mr. Heathcote-Smith, the acting British vice-consul, was attacked and robbed by armed Albanians outside Uskub on Saturday last; and whether, in view of the fact that this is the second attack on British subjects in Turkish territory within the last few weeks, he will take action to prevent the recurrence of such attacks.

MR. RUNCIMAN: My right hon. friend has called for a Report on the case from His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople, and he has received a telegram in reply from which it appears that the incident has been much exaggerated in the accounts published. Mr. Heathcote-Smith was, it is true, attacked by two Albanian robbers two miles from the town of Uskub, but he lost nothing but a book, and was not hurt. The Turkish authorities are doing all in their power to secure the arrest of the robbers, and my right hon. friend does not, therefore, consider it necessary to take any further steps in the matter for the present.

Baptist Mission on the Congo.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has had several communications from the Baptist Missionary Society complaining that Article 6 of the Berlin Act of 1885, relating to the Government of the Congo, under which free and public exercise of every creed, and the right to erect religious buildings and to organise missions is to be subject to no restriction or impediment, has not recently been observed as regards this society, and complaining that a site belonging to the society has been occupied by the Congo Government without compensation and without another having been given in exchange; whether he has received from this society complaints that the fiscal imposts upon materials used for the construction of churches, schools, and hospitals, and for the carrying out of the general work of missionary societies, are heavy and oppressive; and whether he is in a position to state what action he has taken regarding these complaints, and with what result.

MR. RUNCIMAN: My right hon. friend has been for some time past in communication with the society on the subject, and the actual cases which have given rise to complaint are being carefully examined in order to see what action can be taken respecting them.

"The Mikado."

MR. TREVELYAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department what reasons are given for withdrawing the licence to act "The Mikado" in London and the provinces; what alterations or additions have been made in the play since the many hundreds of occasions of its previous presentation to cause the Lord Chamberlain to take a less favourable view of its effect on public taste and morals; and whether the Government will take immediate steps to remove the ban on this popular production.

The following Questions on the same subject were also on the Paper:—

MR. TREVELYAN: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that there is to be a performance of "The Mikado" in Leeds during the present week; whether the action of the Lord Chamberlain will result in its prohibition; and, if so, from what fund compensation will be forthcoming for the company which had intended the production of the play.

MR. GEORGE FABER: To ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department when, and for what reason, the Lord Chamberlain withdrew the licence for the stage representation of the operetta called "The Mikado" after its continuous performance for so many years past; whether the withdrawal is temporary or permanent; whether it applies to the provinces as well as to London; whether it relates to performances by amateur operatic and dramatic societies throughout the United Kingdom; and, in any event, whether performances may still be given in all cases where the contracts and arrangements had been entered into before the withdrawal of the licence had been published.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. GLADSTONE, Leeds, W.): On the question of fact I am informed that the order of the the Lord Chamberlain applies both to London and the provinces, under Section 14 of the Act of 1843, for regulating theatres, and to all public performances of "The Mikado." The order is operative from the date of issue, which was March 26th. No compensation is payable under the Act. No alterations in the text have been made. As to the reasons for the prohibition I can add nothing to the Answer of my right hon. friend the Foreign Secretary on Thursday last.† I am informed by the Lord Chamberlain that it will be a matter for consideration whether, after certain modifications in the text, the present restriction can be subsequently removed.

MR. PIKE PEASE (Darlington): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it would not be possible in future to give rather longer notice in a case of this kind, as a great deal of inconvenience has been caused, especially in the town of Middlesbrough?

MR. GLADSTONE: I will convey that to the Lord Chamberlain. No doubt he will bear it in mind.

MR. GEORGE FABER: Is it a fact that this music is forbidden to be played on ships of war and by regimental bands? May I also ask whether the right hon. Gentleman is aware that the action of the Lord Chamberlain in this matter has made this country ridiculous in the eyes of the civilised world?

MR. GLADSTONE: I strongly protest against the last remark of the hon. Member, and as regards his first Question it has nothing to do with my Department.

*CAPTAIN FABER Will the licence be withdrawn for "H.M.S. Pinafore" which is a satire on another place?

[No Answer was returned.]

The Lord Chamberlain.

MR. VINCENT KENNEDY (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister if he will state whether any Minister of the Crown is responsible to the House of Commons for the action or inaction of the Lord Chamberlain.

THE PRIME MINISTER AND FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, Stirling Burghs): The Home Secretary has been in the habit of answering Parliamentary Question on behalf of the Lord Chamberlain, and of seeing that he is furnished with the best legal advice; but it would require legislation to make him Parliamentarily responsible for the Lord Chamberlain.

County of London Licensing Compensation Fund.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state the approximate amount of the balance of the compensation fund in the hands of the compensation authority for the county of London at the commencement of the present year; the approximate amount of such balance after allowance for the discharge of all claims upon the fund in respect of licences refused in 1906; if sums forming the balance are invested, and, if so, in what manner; what was the purchase price of the investments; and what rate of interest they bear.

MR. GLADSTONE: The balance was £341,616 11s. 9d., the claims amounted to upwards of £250,000, and after they are satisfied there will remain some £89,890. Of the aforesaid balance

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxiii., 1062.

£145,000 were invested in Consols at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the purchase price being $89\frac{29}{32}$ for £120,000 and $90\frac{7}{16}$ for £25,000. The remainder of the balance has borne interest at deposit rate.

Mr. REMNANT: Does the right hon. Gentleman think it wise to invest the money in a fund which fluctuates so much as Consols?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. REMNANT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that the compensation authority for the county of London have this year imposed charges under the Licensing Act, 1904, for the purposes of the compensation fund at the maximum rate; whether he is aware that this will produce, when added to the balance in hand, a sum considerably in excess of any probable requirements for compensation payments for licences refused under the Act in the present year; that the levy has been imposed at the maximum rate owing to a depreciation in the value of the securities in which balances in hand have been invested by the authority, and that the same cause has led to delays in the payment of compensation awards; and whether, having regards to the hardships thus suffered by contributories to the fund, and in cases where there has been delay in the payment of compensation awards, he will consider the advisability of some emendation of Rule 60 of the Licensing Rules, 1904, or will take any other action in the matter.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I am informed that, though the authority considered the fact of the depreciation of Consols—the only securities in which any part of the fund has been invested—it was not on this ground alone that it was deemed necessary to impose the maximum charge; and that there is no reason to anticipate that the proceeds will considerably exceed the requirements in respect of the year 1907. It does not appear from the information which I have received that any delay in paying the compensation monies is due to the depreciation in Consols, and I see no reason at present for any action on my part.

Illegal Storage of Ammunition.

Viscount TURNOUR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is in a position to give the House any information with regard to the alleged illegal storage of ammunition in certain towns in the North of England.

Mr. GLADSTONE: Proceedings have been taken against several persons in respect of this matter, and have been fully reported in the newspapers. I can add nothing of importance to the information given in these reports.

London Postal Service Overseers.

Mr. A. ALLEN (Christchurch): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether it is necessary for all officers promoted to the rank of overseer in the London postal service to have an intimate knowledge of the local sorting, including the town area of the district, when qualifying for promotion.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Mr. Sydney Buxton, Tower Hamlets, Poplar): It is the duty of overseers in the London Postal Service to supervise the work of sorters and postmen, and it is necessary for them to possess such a knowledge of the local sorting as will enable them to discharge this duty efficiently.

Wareham Postmaster's Grievance.

Colonel R. WILLIAMS (Dorsetshire, W.): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General if his attention has been called to the case of Mr. Best, formerly postmaster of Wareham, who, after faithfully discharging his duties for forty-two years and sinking all his savings in erecting a suitable post-office, is now compulsorily retired without any pension; and whether, in view of his long service and the peculiar circumstances of the case, he can recommend any relaxation of the rules in his favour.

Mr. SYDNEY BUXTON: Mr. Best is not an established civil servant. Besides acting as postmaster, he held an outside appointment for many years until 1900, and he also carried on a private business from 1865 until 1896. The Superannuation Acts limit the award of pensions to established officers;

and it is not in my power to obtain exceptional treatment for Mr. Best.

Cable Telegraphists' Allowances.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Postmaster-General whether, seeing that the Post Office decided in 1905 to give telegraphists employed on foreign cables, and who lived in towns outside London, an allowance of 2s. per week, and that the staff employed at Lerwick and who work the foreign cable to the Faröe Islands, and have acquired a knowledge of the Danish language in order to increase their efficiency, have not received the allowance, steps will be taken to give it to them.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON: The allowance referred to is granted to telegraphists who spend the whole or a great portion of their attendance at foreign wires. At Lerwick there is but one foreign wire, and it is not possible to limit the attendance at this wire to one or two sorting clerks and telegraphists. The whole staff take the duty in turn, and the time spent on it by each individual telegraphist is not sufficiont to justify the payment of an allowance.

Ness and Beauly Fishery Rights.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he can now state the names of the landlords who claim fishery rights to the estuary of the Ness and Beauly rivers; and to what extent those rights extend seawards from the Beauly and Ness rivers respectively.

THE SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SINCLAIR, Forfarshire): I am informed by the clerks to the district board that, so far as they are aware, the only proprietors who claim rights to salmon fishing in the estuary of the Beauly are Lord Lovat and Mr. Biscoe of Newton. The rights would apparently extend to Kessock Ferry in the case of Lord Lovat, but only *ex adverso* of Mr. Biscoe's land. The proprietors who claim right to salmon fishings in the estuary of the Ness are Mrs. Darwin of Muirtown, the town of Inverness, the Inverness Harbour Trustees, the Crown, Mrs. Crosbie of Flowerburn, Mr. Fletcher of Rosehaugh, the War Office, Donald Macdonald of Kessock, and Robert McLean of Drynie. The rights of these proprietors are believed to extend to the fishings *ex adverso* of their respective lands.

Small Holdings in County Roxburgh.

MR. SMEATON: On behalf of the hon. Member for Roxburghshire, I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he will be able to start an early inquiry as to the need of small holdings at Newcastleton and other parts of the parish of Castleton, in Liddesdale, in the county of Roxburgh.

MR. SINCLAIR: If my hon. friend has in view the exercise by the Agricultural Commissioners of their powers under the Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill now before Parliament, I must ask him to defer such inquiries until a later date.

Sporting Estates in Aberdeenshire.

MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD: I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether he has now any information regarding enclosures and the extension of sporting ground on Mr. Heaven's estate near Aboyne, Aberdeenshire; whether he is aware that, in an adjoining estate of Glen Tara, belonging to Mr. Coats, the tenant of Easter Millfield, a man of seventy-three, whose family has been in the Glen for 200 years, and who is the last of the flourishing smallholders of Glen Tara, is under notice to quit; whether the farm of Tillycairn is now being put under grass for shooting purposes; whether, close at hand, part of the farm of Cobbleheugh has just been added to the sporting area, and the tenant is leaving at Whitsuntide; whether the tenant of the farm of Craigendinnie is also under notice to quit at Whitsuntide, in order that the sporting value of Mr. Coats' estate may be enhanced; and whether, in view of the reduction of the rural population of Aberdeenshire and the number of emigrants from the country to Canada, the Government will take any immediate action to prevent the absorption of paying farms into sporting areas.

MR. SINCLAIR: I have made inquiries with regard to the two estates referred to by the hon. Member. No information has yet reached me with regard to the former. With regard to the latter estate my information is as follows: The tenant of Easter Millfield expressed a desire to be relieved of his farm; this was agreed to; at the same time a small croft on the estate was offered to him, but he did not accept it. The tenant of Tillycairn asked to be relieved of his farm as a special favour, the farm is not being put under grass for shooting purposes but is being worked from the home farm. Twenty-five acres of rough land covered with broom is being resumed from the farm of Cobbleheugh, the remaining portion of the farm, 175 acres, was offered to the late tenant, but on his not taking it, it was at once let at an advanced rent. The tenant of Craigendinnie, with whom the proprietor was satisfied in every way, is leaving at Whitsuntide, but as the present farmhouse and steading adjoins the mansion house, the proprietor has decided, as a sanitary precaution, to take the farm into his own hands. I have only to add that the attitude of the Government in regard to rural depopulation in Scotland and the maintenance of small farms is shown in the Small Landholders Bill now before Parliament.

Dog Poisoning in Sutherland.

MR. MORTON (Sutherland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland whether his attention has been drawn to the poisoning of the crofters' dogs in the neighbourhood of Badininish, Skelbo, Sutherland; whether he is aware that a dog is absolutely necessary to the crofter; will he take steps to put an end to this persecution of crofters; and is he aware that putting poison about may be a danger to human beings as well as animals.

MR. SINCLAIR: I am informed that five dogs have died apparently by poison, and it is said the farmers have suffered heavily through lamb-worrying. There is, however, no charge against anyone and no evidence. If any complaint is made against anybody it will be investigated in the usual way by the Procurator Fiscal.

Scottish Landlords' Claim to Seaweed.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary for Scotland if he is aware that certain proprietors in the North of Scotland claim the seaweed as their own particular property; that persons desirous of earning a little by the collection of seaweed and the manufacture of kelp, under arduous conditions and often in the most inclement weather, can only do so by leave, and have to sell at what price the proprietor cares to give: and whether, in view of the above facts, he will cause inquiry to be made as to the conditions under which the seaweed is gathered, burned, and sold as kelp, and if it possible to establish the industry on a more equitable basis.

MR. SINCLAIR: I am taking steps to inform myself upon this matter, and will confer with my hon. friend in a few days time.

MR. BYLES: Is the seaweed growing below high-water mark claimed as private property?

MR. SINCLAIR: I will confer with the hon. Member.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): How much capital have the landlords sunk in this industry?

Irish Board of Works Staff.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what is the exact *status* of a supernumerary staff officer, and in what Dublin offices are officials with this designation employed; whether he will state the circumstances which rendered such an appointment necessary in the office of the Board of Works, Dublin, and is it to be assumed that it was to meet temporary pressure, and, if so, has this pressure passed away, and will the officer concerned now revert to his original grade; why a former personal clerk of Sir Robert Holmes was transferred to this office in the capacity named, considering that at the same time he is receiving an allowance as a private secretary to Sir George Holmes; and under what circumstances were such exceptional measures necessary in an office the assistant secretary of which is now being spared indefinitely to the Railway Commission without any apparent inconvenience to the Department.

MR. RUNCIMAN: The appointment in question was made in connection with a partial reorganisation of the staff of the Board of Works agreed upon between the Treasury and the Board. The officer referred to was considered to possess special qualifications for the duties he was required to fulfil, and these expectations have been fully confirmed. Pending, however, the completion of the staff arrangements, for which opportunity has not offered, the post was not regarded as of a substantive character. It is not the case that this officer is receiving an allowance as private secretary. As regards the last part of the Question, the expert knowledge of the assistant secretary on railway matters was placed at the disposal of the Commission so long as he could conveniently be spared. The arrangement is, of course, of only a temporary nature.

Dublin County Council and Land Purchase.

Mr. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury how the sum deducted in respect of land purchase transactions from the grants payable to the Dublin County Council is made up; and whether he will state the statutory enactments respectively by the authority of which the Treasury considers itself entitled to make the several deductions in question.

Mr. RUNCIMAN: The proportion, of the total amount drawn from the Guarantee Fund in 1907, chargeable to County Dublin amounted to £1,574 11s. 7d. This sum is made up as follows:—Drawn under the Irish Land Act, 1903—

	£
Arrears of Annuities - - -	325
Unearned dividend on issues of Stock - - - - - -	488
Advance dividend - - -	280
Interest due but not received -	318
Unproductive balances - -	185
	1,596
Less—Repaid to Guarantee Fund under Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891 - - -	21
	£1,575

As regards the remaining portion of the Question, I beg to refer the hon. Member to my Answers to the hon. Member for Waterford of the 22nd and the 29th ultimo.†

Prince Bulow and Disarmament.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of Germany's final refusal to discuss the subject of disarmament at the forthcoming Peace Conference, he will stop all pending discharges of workmen from Woolwich Arsenal and Dockyard till after the Conference has completed its labours.

I beg also to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of Prince von Bulow's recent statement in the German Reichstag on the subject of disarmament, the Government intend to proceed immediately with the building of the third battleship of this year's programme.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: His Majesty's Government recognise the importance of the statement made by Prince Bulow. It is also apparent from the tone of that statement that the German Government desire, while maintaining their own view, to avoid causing difficulties or embarrassment to other Powers who are interested in this question. His Majesty's Government for their part desire to deal with the question in the same spirit and to avoid any action which is likely to be embarrassing to any other Power. They also recognise that any question of expenditure on armaments cannot be dealt with except by agreement and consent, but they are not prepared at the present moment to make any further statement as to their own programme of shipbuilding and the expenditure connected with it.

Lords-Lieutenant of Counties.

Mr. WHITEHEAD (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the proposal in the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill to entrust military responsibilities to the lords-lieutenant and the national importance thereby attached to this office, the Government will introduce legislation securing that the office shall no longer be held for life, but shall, like other military appointments, be subject to an age limit, and shall be made only for a term of years renewable at the option of the Crown.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It is impossible at this early stage to answer this Question in detail. The question whether a change should be made is receiving consideration.

---

† See (4) *Debates*, clxxii., 1425 *et seq*; clxxiii., 543.

Cost of Poor Law Administration.

Mr. PIKE PEASE: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the total cost of Poor Law Administration (including interest on loans) was approximately £15,000,000 for the last financial year, and that in spite of this fact there are more vagrants without any visible means of subsistence in the United Kingdom than in any other European country; and, under these circumstances, will His Majesty's Government consider the advisability of carrying out the unanimous recommendations of the Departmental Vagrancy Committee, which reported on 21st February, 1906.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The amount expended for the relief of the poor in England and Wales in the year ended at Lady Day, 1906, was £14,218,598, exclusive of expenditure out of loans. The amount of the expenditure during the last financial year has not yet been ascertained. The Local Government Board are not aware of any reliable figures enabling a comparison to be made between the number of vagrants in the United Kingdom and in other European countries. The matter is receiving the consideration of the Home Office and the Local Government Board which are the Departments concerned, but I am advised that legislation would be necessary to give effect to the principal recommendations of the Committee, and I am afraid that it will not be practicable to propose legislation on the subject this year.

State-aided Education and Universities.

Mr. MURRAY MACDONALD (Falkirk Burghs): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the recent and prospective increased expenditure upon the improvement and development of State-aided education, of the importance of connecting it more closely with the universities, and of the fact that more than twenty-six years have elapsed since the last public inquiry into the universities and colleges of Oxford and Cambridge was held, he will appoint a commission to examine into the desirability of amending the existing enactments with regard to the finances, emoluments, and government of these universities.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: This is a very large Question. I am disposed to agree with my hon. friend that the conditions of the universities are ripe for a thorough and comprehensive inquiry, but I am not disposed to add, at the present moment, to the number of Royal Commissions already existing.

Colonial Conference—Debate on Preference.

Captain CRAIG: I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the verbatim report of the speech recently delivered by the Honourable Alfred Deakin, Prime Minister of Australia, at the Conference of Colonial Premiers, on the subject of Colonial preference was withheld from the Press with the hon. Gentleman's sanction; and whether, in view of the importance of this particular message from the Commonwealth of Australia to the Mother Country, he will respectfully beg the hon. Gentleman's permission to have it handed in full to the Press.

Viscount TURNOUR: At the same time may I ask the Prime Minister whether the verbatim reports of the speeches of the Imperial delegates to the Colonial Conference on the preference resolutions will be laid upon the Table of the House before the Conference rises.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The Conference has not finally determined the question of the publication of the whole of its proceedings which was reserved when it resolved to issue a *précis* of each day's proceedings. With regard to the discussion on the preference resolutions publication has been proposed, but at the last meeting of the Conference it was resolved that the debate on this subject must first be concluded. I cannot say whether it will be possible to publish before the Conference rises.

Mr. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): Who is responsible for preparing the *précis*, and is the *précis*, when prepared, submitted for the approval of the Conference before it is issued to the Press?

Sir H. CAMPBELL BANNERMAN: I cannot answer the Question. I have no doubt there are competent people who make the *précis*—persons selected by the Colonial Office; and as to the submission to the members of the Conference, I should have thought that would cause delay. But if the hon. Member puts the Question down I will obtain such Answer as I can.

VISCOUNT TURNOUR asked whether the Colonial Office or the Conference was responsible for the *précis*, and also who was responsible for the publication almost in full detail of the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the preference resolution, and the publication of a by no means verbatim report of the speeches of the other members.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not know that the facts are as stated by the noble Lord. If he puts that Question on the Paper I will get, as I have said, such Answer as I can from the Conference.

MR. PIKE PEASE: Are the figures given in the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer official figures?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Mr. ASQUITH, Fife, E.): Yes, Sir, they are. They are perfectly accurate in every particular.

CAPTAIN CRAIG asked the Prime Minister whether, in response to a largely expressed desire, a special exception could not be made of this particular speech and a full report given to the public?

MR. ASQUITH: Does the hon. Member refer to my speech?

CAPTAIN CRAIG: No; I was referring to the speech of Mr. Deakin.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The hon. Member speaks of a general desire. I do not know, but I can ascertain. The whole thing is being done perfectly in order under the direction and instruction and with the full knowledge of the Conference.

MR. REMNANT (Finsbury, Holborn): Did the Chancellor of the Exchequer take his figures from the Blue-book as published?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. That does not arise out of the original Question.

Reports of Colonial Conferences.

MR. STANGER (Kensington, N.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the proceedings of the last Colonial Conference were fully reported; and, if not, whether, in the event of the present Conference deciding that a full report of its proceedings shall be published, an equally full report of the proceedings of the last Conference can be published at the same time.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir, the proceedings at the last Colonial Conference were not fully published, in consequence, I understand, of objection being taken to that course by some of its members. Whether a full report of the proceedings of that Conference will be issued at the present time is a question for the decision of the Conference itself.

Land Valuation (Scotland) Bill.

MR. C. E. PRICE (Edinburgh, Central): I beg to ask the Prime Minister when the Land Valuation (Scotland) Bill will be introduced.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir; I cannot yet fix a day, but I hope very shortly.

The Under-Secretary for War.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether the Under-Secretary of State for War has resigned; and, if not, whether the Government will give to the House of Commons an opportunity of expressing its opinion on the continued retention of office by the Under-Secretary.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: In reply to the noble Lord I might almost ask what grounds he has for suggesting that the Under-Secretary for War has resigned, for such a question must be founded on some element of fact, and up to the present time I have not heard of any such rumour or resignation. With regard to the second part of the noble Lord's Question, he must see that with the amount of public business that the House has on hand at the present moment, it would be very difficult, even if not impossible, to provide time for the discussion of the action of the Under-Secretary for War.

*CAPTAIN FABER: May I ask the Prime Minister whether it is not a fact that only recently another tenant of the noble Lord the Under-Secretary for War gave notice——[Cries of "Order, order."]

*MR. SPEAKER: When I rise, the hon. and gallant Member should resume his seat.

CAPTAIN FABER: I apologise; I did not see you, Sir.

LORD R. CECIL: May I ask whether an opportunity will not occur on the Estimates or otherwise for the House to express its opinion on this question?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I do not know that it is a question on which the House ought to be called upon to express an opinion.

MR. LEA (St. Pancras, E.): Having in view the great danger to the Liberal Party from the retention in office of this noble landlord, will the Prime Minister give an opportunity to hon. Members sitting below the gangway to express their views?

SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I think the hon. Member has already expressed his views.

Irish Council Bill.

MR. BARRIE (Londonderry, N.): I beg to ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the importance of the Central Council (Ireland) Bill, he will arrange to allow three days for the debate on the First Reading.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir, I think such an allowance would be quite excessive and unnecessary. I can find no precedent for such a course. The Local Government (County Councils) Act, 1888, had one day for First Reading; The Local Government (Parish Councils) Act, 1894, one day; The Irish Local Government (County Councils) Act, 1898, one day; The Education Act, 1902, one day; The Education Bill, 1906, one day; and one day, I think, will be quite sufficient in the present case.

*CAPTAIN CRAIG: Is it not the fact that four days were given to the First Reading of the last Home Rule Bill?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That is quite possible.

Political Pensions.

MR. WATT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that an applicant for a political pension is required to make a declaration of poverty or of inadequacy of means before he obtains such pension, he will take steps to secure that no person in future makes this declaration and yet becomes a Member of this House.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The declaration in question is to the effect that the applicant's private fortune is inadequate to maintain his station in life. I do not see how I can prevent any person, whether a Member of this House or not, from making such a declaration.

Pacific Islanders Act.

MR. MITCHELL-THOMSON: I beg to ask the Prime Minister when it is proposed to introduce the Bill to amend the Pacific Islanders Act.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir, I cannot yet say when this Bill will be introduced.

Blocking Motions and Bills.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government have made any progress with the new Standing Order against blocking Bills and Motions; and when it is intended to introduce this Order.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The new Order is in course of preparation and will shortly be submitted to the Opposition Whips with the idea of securing unanimous assent. It will then be placed upon the paper.

LORD R. CECIL: When will it be submitted?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Really, I cannot say from day to day what the Cabinet will do. We are losing no time in the matter. This is about the fifth or sixth question I have been asked to answer. I think we might be allowed to proceed with deliberation and care in regard to this matter.

LORD R. CECIL: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he has in his mind the fact that this question was raised before the Easter holidays and that the excuse given immediately after the Easter holidays was that the Government had been away on their holidays?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: This is not the only thing that has engaged our attention.

ADVERTISEMENTS REGULATION BILL.

Reported, with Amendments, from Standing Committee A.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 138.]

Minutes of the Proceedings of the Standing Committee to be printed. [No. 138.]

Bill, as amended (in the Standing Committee), to be taken into consideration upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 177.]

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Sir BRAMPTON GURDON reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from Standing Committee C (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill): Major McMicking; and had appointed in substitution (in respect of the Patents and Designs Bill): Mr. Timothy Davies.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SMALL HOLDINGS (No. 3) BILL.

Order for Second Reading upon Friday read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL (ALLOCATION OF TIME).

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Proceedings on the Motion for the Allocation of Time for the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, if under discussion at Eleven o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order (Sittings of the House)."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

The House divided:—Ayes, 313; Noes, 95. (Division List No. 156.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)
Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Jn. Emmott (Somerset)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Belloc, Hilaire Joseph Peter R
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Boulton, A. C. F.
Bowerman, C. W.
Branch, James
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt H Sir J. T. (Cheshire)
Bryce, J. Annan
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Syndey Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Coats, Sir T. Glen (Renfrew, W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H. (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cox, Harold
Craig, Herbert J. (Tynemouth)
Crean, Eugene
Crombie, John William
Crooks, William
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Dickinson, W. H. (St. Pancras, N
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Dillon, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Edwards, Frank (Radnor)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gibb, James (Harrow)
Ginnell, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert Jn.
Glendinning, R. G.

Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r.)
Harrington, Timothy
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Horniman, Emslie John
Howard, Hon. Geoffrey
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jacoby, Sir James Alfred
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kettle, Thomas Michael
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Molteno, Percy Alport
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Murray, James
Myer, Horatio
Napier, T. B.
Nicholls, George
Nicholson, Charles N. (Doncast'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norman, Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Dowd, John
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W. H. M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps, J. Wynford (Pembroke
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Priestley, W. E. B. (Bradford, E.)
Pullar, Sir Robert
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Richards, Thomas (W. Monm'th
Richards, T. F. (Wolverhampt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E. (Dundee)
Robertson, Sir G. Scott (Bradford
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rogers, F. E. Newman
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Schwann, Sir C. E. (Manchester)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seely, Major J. B.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur Jame
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Soares, Ernest J.
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Steadman, W. C.
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Sutherland, J. E.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward (Salisbury
Thomas, Sir A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson, J. W. H. (Somerset, E
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent
Ward, W. Dudley (Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Williams, Llewelyn (Carmarth')
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Winfrey, R.
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES:—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell.
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hon. Sir
Balfour, RtHn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Baring, Capt. Hn. G(Winchester
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.)
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hon. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, RtHn. J. A. (Worc
Clark, George Smith (Belfast, N.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig, CharlesCurtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, CaptainJames (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Cross, Alexander
Dalrymple, Viscount
Dixon-Hartland, SirFred Dixon
Du Cros, Harvey
Duncan, Robert(Lanark, Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, J.
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Heaton, John Henniker
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm's
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W.
Kimber, Sir Henry
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Lee, ArthurH. (Hants., Fareham
Liddell, Henry
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Magnus, Sir Philip
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nicholson, Wm. G. (Petersfield)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Parker, SirGilbert (Gravesend)
Pease, HerbertPike(Darlington)
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson, John FrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rothschild, Hon. LionelWalter
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Sheffield, SirBerkeleyGeorge D.
Sloan, Thomas Henry
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL.

(ALLOCATION OF TIME).

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, in moving a Resolution in regard to the allocation of time to the various stages of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, said:—I wish candidly to say, what must be present to everyone's mind, that this Resolution which I have placed upon the Paper is a novelty. We are not unaccustomed to time-table Resolutions, but we usually introduce them in another way. The usual course has been that we enter into the Committee stage of a Bill and we go on with it possibly sometimes with great minuteness and great expenditure of time until at last it becomes an imperative—an absolute—necessity to intervene and prevent, by any further extension of time, any interference with the progress of the general business of the session. Then in a hurried way the Government of the day introduces a guillotine Resolution of this kind, allocating a certain amount of time to certain parts of the Bill. That is always open to the objection that we flounder in the first portion of the proceedings and we scramble in the second. Neither one nor the other is a very business-like way of proceeding. The Bill we have under our consideration to-day is a peculiar Bill. The natural course after the House had adopted certain new Rules of Procedure which occupied our attention some time ago would be for this Bill to be sent to a Committee upstairs, with the exception of the financial clauses, which must remain to be considered here. That would have been the natural course, and I should have thought that this was a Bill that might be very properly dealt with in that manner, because we are all agreed with its main purpose. I trust there is in no part of the House any disagreement of opinion with regard to that. We are agreed as to the main purpose of the Bill, and I think hon. Members in all parts of the House will recognise that this is not a mere hasty effort to hang up a fancy and perhaps pretentious scheme with a view to gaining a little political advantage, and that they will all admit it is a subject which has received the most sedulous and serious consideration by my right hon. friend the head of the War Department and those who have advised and collaborated with him in the matter. It is also a Bill of much detail, and the detail is wholly connected with the machinery for bringing the Bill into operation. It is not machinery which involves to any great extent anything in the nature of principle, and therefore both Parties must be united in recognising that it is a Bill for a praiseworthy object, and the result of praiseworthy attention and preparation. On the ground also that the nature of most of its provisions is just that which should be considered by a Committee, I should have expected the Bill would have gone without much grumbling to a Committee upstairs. But objection was taken to that on the ground that, as, after all, we were dealing with a very important matter, namely, the safety and defence of the country, the Bill had a claim to public consideration perhaps greater than some other Bills that come before us. We wished to meet that objection, and accordingly it was announced by my right hon. friend that we would not take the usual course, and send the Bill upstairs, but would leave it to be considered by a Committee of the Whole House. Having made this concession we think it should not be made the means of impeding the general progress of business by too particular and minute discussion upon the details of a principle to which the House has already agreed. As that is our object, and this Resolution has been framed with a view of attaining that object, I hope that after all there will be substantial agreement on the subject. It seems to be a perfectly fair, equitable, reasonable, and certainly a straightforward course to take. But then two things were said: the first was that no proceeding such as this should be recommended to the House except as part of a general method of dealing with business of this kind, and the other practical suggestion was that we should have a Committee of Business to allocate the time. I have through long years expressed myself as being in favour of a Committee of Business. But a Committee of Business is not set up in a minute. An attempt was made a few weeks ago to have a little conversation on this subject, but it passed over, and I have not repeated the attempt. The truth is we have spent a great deal of time over Procedure this session, and I do not think we can devote any more. Undoubtedly if any proposal as to a Committee of Business were brought forward at this time of the session, a great deal of time would be spent. Therefore, we have to deal in the best way we can with the matter in the absence of any such provision. And I really think that we could not do anything better, nor take any course more in accordance with common sense and with business propriety, and in the interests of the House, than the course to which we are asking the House to consent. I will go through the Resolution, and I think I shall be able to show that we have apportioned the time in a fair spirit, and on a well-thought out plan. In the first place, we give ample opportunity for discussing the really important points. We do not wish important points to be smuggled through and crushed out of the debate. There is ample time by this arrangement for hon. Members to look ahead, and to reserve themselves for the really important points; and, at the same time, we have regard to the necessity of advancing public business as rapidly as is consistent with the proper discharge of our duties in the consideration of the Bill in Committee. If hon. Members will look at the Bill they will see that what I give is an accurate account of the effect of the Resolution. On the first day we propose that we shall take Clauses 1 and 2 and the Committee stage of the Financial Resolution. Clause 1 constitutes the associations. That is a very important clause. It is a great step in the way of decentralisation, and it adheres to and puts in force the principle which has been generally accepted, of the separation of command and training from the mere work of local administrative business and financial control. That, as I say, is an important clause. I do not enter upon the merits of the particular plan; that would be out of place just now. To that clause we give, naturally, a considerable portion of the time, as we recognise its importance. Clause 2 provides directions as to the Army Council's giving proper powers to the associations. I would say of that clause, although it seems somewhat elaborate, that it consists of detailed provisions which are illustrations of the things which ought to be done; and the action of the associations will be brought annually before Parliament for discussion, condemnation, criticism, or approval, every year on the Vote, which will be a separate Vote, taken for the Territorial Army. It merely gives power to the Army Council to do certain things. On the second day we propose to take the report of the Financial Resolution, and Clauses 3 and 4. What are Clauses 3 and 4? Number three deals with finance. The money will be spent partly by the General Officer Commanding, who takes the troops out for training, with which the association has nothing to do, and the money spent is controlled and audited according to the Army Vote under the military system which we have at present. The rest of the money is handed over to the decentralised body—the associations, and they also will be subject to a regular system of control and audit, which has been devised with a view to making them as perfect as possible, and I believe that end has been successfully attained. On the third day we propose to take Clauses 5, 6, and 7—those affecting the raising and maintaining of the force. The principles on which those forces are composed have been so fully discussed on the First Reading and Second Reading—about four days being occupied by the debate—that really I doubt if there is much more to be said. We approach this subject with a full knowledge of the arguments which have been used on previous occasions on both sides of the House. On the fourth day we take the clauses from 8 to 12, which affect enlistment in the service and discharge; these also have been very fully discussed. I do not think this is asking too much. On the fifth day we will take Clauses 13 to 27, the first of which is to make provisions as to the annual training and embodiment, the arrangements for which are substantially identical with, or at any rate do not go beyond, the rules to which the Volunteers subject themselves at present. Volunteer corps, as we all know, adopt rules which are signed by the Volunteers when they join, and this Bill expresses those Rules with some necessary modifications. That does not seem to be much for the fifth day. On the sixth day we take the clauses from 28 to the end of the Bill. These relate to the special Reservists. We allow two days for the Report stage, and one day for the Third Reading. And we have a provision in the Resolution which secures that the time of those days shall not be interrupted by private business.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR (City of London): We have put down an Amendment as to that.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That shows our catholic spirit. That is the disposition with which we approach this subject. I really think, when we consider it, that the ordinary and natural course for a Bill of this kind would be to send it to a Committee upstairs, and then that it should come down to the House; but we have agreed to keep it in the House in order that hon. Members may be satisfied that they will have ample opportunity for discussion. We only guard ourselves against a waste of the time of the House on smaller matters, which would have been better expended on important points, and against any operation which might be desired—as in the course of my experience of the House of Commons has sometimes occurred—not so much in the interests of the Bill as in respect of the interests of some other measure, which for the moment might not be immediately under the consideration of the House. I think the objects of the Resolution are legitimate objects, and that these provisions will really prevent what I have described as the method of floundering for half the time and scrambling for the other half, while enabling hon. Members who are interested in the subject to secure, if they like, a good opportunity of discussing the really important points. In that sense I think it is a business-like proposal, and I submit it with confidence to the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Committee stage and Report stage of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, including the Financial Resolution relating thereto, shall be proceeded with in the following manner: (a) That Clauses 1 and 2 and the Committee stage of the Financial Resolution be proceeded with, and proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day; (b) That the Report stage of the Financial Resolution and Clauses 3 and 4 be proceeded with, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day;

(c) That Clauses 5 to 7 be proceeded with, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the third allotted day; (d) That Clauses 8 to 12 be proceeded with, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day; (e) That Clauses 13 to 27 be proceeded with, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day; (f) That the remaining Clauses of the Bill and the Schedules, and any new Government clauses and any new Government Schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with and brought to a conclusion on the sixth allotted day, and that the Chairman report the Bill to the House without Question put; (g) That two allotted days be given to the Report stage of the Bill, and that new clauses and Clauses 1 to 15 of the Bill be proceeded with on the first of those allotted days, and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day, and that the remaining clauses of the Bill and the Schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Report stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with on the second of those allotted days and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day.

"After this Order comes into operation, any day (other than a Friday) shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day, or on which any stage of the Financial Resolution relating thereto is put down as the first Order of the Day, followed by the Bill.

"At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business alloted to that day are to be brought to a conclusion, the Chairman or Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or Schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the clause or Schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

"At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the Day, or if that day is a Friday at 5 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

"Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not, on any allotted day on which proceedings or any business are to be brought to a conclusion under this Order, be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House.

"After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill (including the Financial Resolution relating thereto) stand as first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The right hon. Gentleman has performed what I have no doubt was to him a distasteful task, with great moderation and amiability; but I do not think that anybody who heard the speech in which he defended the proposals, and which you, Sir, have just read from the chair, would be likely to be seriously moved by the arguments he has advanced. The right hon. Gentleman admits that he has invented on this occasion a new kind of Parliamentary guillotine. I do not know whether the inventive powers of the Government in other departments of legislative activity show to great advantage during the two years they have been in office, but certainly no one will deny that they have shown ingenuity in dealing with the liberties of this House, and they have been fertile in expedients for limiting those opportunities of debate by which they set such marvellous store when they were sitting on this side of the House. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to read a short quotation from a speech which he made, not upon the occasion of any closure or guillotine Resolution moved by his predecessors in office, but upon the occasion when the whole of the Rules were under consideration, and when the late Government brought forward a scheme which was in part accepted by the House, and under which we are now working, for the improvement of our procedure. The speech to which I refer was one moderate in tone, and in which I am sure the right hon. Gentleman was not moved by any of those Party considerations which at at the time he vehemently, and, I think, quite sincerely excluded. The right hon. Gentleman spoke thus. I ought to remind the House that he was describing the importance of this Assembly as being the great "inquest of the nation"; and he went on to say—

"For my part I will go so far as to say that efficiency in the conduct of business,"

—that is to say, efficiency in carrying through legislative projects—

"is mainly secondary to the maintenance of those rights of which I speak, and it would be better that the House should be less efficient in its transaction of business,"

—that is legislative business—

"and retain the full faculty to exercise the functions to which I refer,"

—namely, the grand inquest of the nation—

"rather than that it should be diminished and the House should become the most perfect legislative machine in the world."

Those were the principles which weighed with the right hon. Gentleman at that time.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Hear, hear. [MINISTERIAL cheers.]

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I gather from the cheers with which the right hon. Gentleman and his supporters greet the quotation that he holds them now. But I fear I shall get nothing from the right hon. Gentleman but his cheers. While I cannot allow that the right hon. Gentleman and his friends have made the House a perfect legislative machine, they have devoted infinite time and trouble to making it a more rapidly working machine—not a better, but a quicker machine.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Therefore giving it more time, to the advantage of the nation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Let the House notice how the grand-inquest-of-the-nation theory works. The right hon. Gentleman has now allocated nine days in all for the remaining stages of this Bill. On not one of those nine days, representing between two and three weeks of Parliamentary time, will it be possible to move, even in the most urgent circumstances, the adjournment of the House in order to discuss any matter of public interest. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman seriously maintains that his object has been to give the critics of the Government freer scope than they had before he took this business in hand. I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman and his friends are more afraid of criticism than their predecessors, but I think they will be the first to admit that the actual practical result of what he has done will be to diminish the power of the House to deal as critics with the action of the Government. As to whether he has made this House a more perfect legislative machine I will not inquire, but I entertain grave doubts on that subject. What is the plan of the right hon. Gentleman? He has referred in his speech to a scheme which has often been adumbrated, under which some machinery should be devised of an impartial character in order to allocate the time to be devoted to Government measures. The right hon. Gentleman has stated that he has always been in favour of a scheme of that sort, and in making that statement he finds sympathetic auditors on the Opposition side of the House. But may I point out this to the right hon. Gentleman and to hon. Members who do me the honour to listen to me: that nothing in the world can be more difficult than the elaboration of an impartial tribunal to allocate the time of the House is shown by this scheme under which the Government make themselves judges in their own cause. An impartial tribunal would have to consider not the amount of time that remains between now and the time at which the Government propose to terminate the session, but the inherent and intrinsic importance of the questions brought before them; otherwise a Government which chose to bring in an unconscionable number of measures of the first class would be able to squeeze the discussion of them into an equally unconscionably brief space of time. Any tribunal dealing with the time to be allotted to particular Bills ought to consider the normal amount of work thrown upon Parliament, and the amount of time which can fairly and properly be devoted to the discussion of any particular measure The right hon. Gentleman appears to be under the impression that, although the Government have constituted themselves judges in their own cause, hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House ought to say, "We thank the Government for the liberality of their treatment: they might have sent the Bill upstairs, but they have kept it down here, and allowed time for discussion." But we really cannot accept that view. It is quite true, as the Prime Minister says, that there were protests—not, I think, entirely from this side of the House—against sending the Bill upstairs, but what was the alternative present in the minds of those who made the protest? The alternative was keeping it down here. I cannot accept the contention of the Government that the retention of the Bill in the House for Committee, coupled with the conditions of this closure Resolution, is liberal treatment of the Opposition. Personally I would have preferred free discussion in a Committee upstairs and free discussion on Report in the House to limited discussion in the House at both stages. Just consider for a moment what the allocation of time is. The right hon. Gentleman has gone through the clauses of the Bill, and he has come to the conclusion that there is ample time under this Resolution in each Department for dealing with all the clauses, and he bases that contention partly on the fact that we have had a very long discussion already upon the proposals of the Minister for War. The Minister for War made some very interesting speeches last year, and produced some interesting plans, which received a certain amount of discussion. Last year's debates, on which the Prime Minister partly founds his contention as to the adequacy of the time now given, are irrelevant to this debate. The Government are either greatly under-rating the importance of their own proposals or greatly under-rating the time the House would have occupied in debating them if left free. I observe that he has devoted five days out of six to the question of the Territorial Army, and the allied question of the county committees. One day only will be available for the discussion of what I personally regard as by far the most important part of the Bill—that part which creates the Special Reserve and by implication destroys the Militia. Surely that is wholly absurd. To discuss the creation of the Special Reserve and the destruction of the Militia, the Prime Minister appears to think that one whole day between the hour of four in the afternoon and eleven at night will be amply sufficient. I must say that I cannot agree with him, and if he will reflect on the matter he will see how difficult his position is to defend. The Militia is a historic force deeply rooted in the traditions of the country, and they have played a most important part in the past in our general readiness for war. Although I admit that the strength, organisation, and training of the Militia leaves much to be desired, everybody will be ready to admit that in a serious conflict the Militia can be used, and ought to be used, to relieve the more highly trained troops in the service of the Crown. The House does not yet know what it will cost to convert the guns for the Volunteer artillery, to create the ranges, and they have no information upon the more important question of the Regular artillery. The right hon. Gentleman and I have had conferences across the Table on the subject, and I have never yet got to the bottom of his mind upon it. I have always understood that he meant to destroy 3,800, or some number of that kind, of the Artillery. Personally I regard that as absolutely disastrous; but while it would be out of order to argue that point, it is strictly relevant to this question to say that although we know what the policy of the Government is in regard to the Regular Artillery, we really cannot form a judgment as to their policy in regard to the Volunteer Artillery. The two things are intimately bound together. We do not know what the policy is, and until we know how can we discuss it? All that information has to be elicited from the Government under these privileged conditions which enable the Government to answer or not to answer just as they like, for they know that when the automatic hour strikes the debate comes to a conclusion, and questions asked and unanswered remain asked and unanswered, no answer or cross-examination is possible; the Chairman has automatically to put the question at the appointed hour, and the House may finish its debate as ignorant at the end as it was at the beginning on matters which are really material to the decision of the problem the Government have laid before us. The Prime Minister told us just now that under the former system of guillotine the House floundered in the earlier and scrambled during the later part of the discussion. At all events, there is to be said for the former procedure that the liberties of the House were not curtailed until experience had shown to the Government of the day that such curtailment was necessary. Here you mean to shut up and to confine a possible malefactor, not because he has done anything wrong, but because he may do something wrong. Of course, that may be consistent with the views of the Government on Parliamentary procedure, but it is not in accordance with the laws of ordinary criminal jurisprudence. I want to know whether this process of floundering and scrambling is going to be avoided, or is likely to be avoided, by the plan proposed by the Government. The advantage of some impartial tribunal, who shall allot the time, if it can be carried out, is that there should be some kind of consent and co-operation between the two sides of the House, and that the critics in the House, naturally not all drawn from the Opposition side, would feel that they were not being trampled upon, and that they should co-operate with the Government in seeing that the most important questions had most time allotted to them. How are you going to attain that under this Motion? Do the Government really think that those who desire to criticise the Bill regard this as fair treatment? Do they think they can claim this system of co operation, which under a different system, and in happier circumstances, they might be able to command, and if they cannot command that hearty and zealous co-operation, what is to prevent the floundering and scrambling under this Motion reaching the same pitch as it has reached under other systems, and in connection with other measures? I regret the course the Government have taken, and I wonder whether they do not feel themselves that, of all Governments, they are the administrators who ought to be most sensitive that there should be full House of Commons criticism of the Bill, because they have announced their intention that there shall not be full control in the second chamber of measures which leave us and go elsewhere. I might be out of order if I were to discuss either the merits or the demerits, the utility or the inutility, of a Second Chamber. But everybody who sees a Resolution of this sort on the Paper must be conscious that the result of it may be, and very likely will be, that a great measure affecting the value of our Army in war, and closely connected with the fortunes of the Volunteer and Auxiliary Forces, may leave this House imperfectly discussed in Committee and on Report, and that when it goes to another place the House of Lords will not have before them the mind of this House, and the result of our criticisms and discussions, for we shall not have criticised and discussed it. I confess if I were engaged in the crusade in which the right hon. Gentleman has, rightly or wrongly, embarked in connection with the ancient Constitution of this country, I should be very careful, when trying to establish a system of one Chamber Legislature, at all events to see that the liberties of that one Chamber were sedulously safe-guarded. The right hon. Gentleman has not taken that course, and I shall certainly resist the Motion which has been proposed.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) said the Leader of the Opposition had touched upon a most important subject in regard to guillotine Resolutions. Such Resolutions would undoubtedly help and support the House of Lords in connection with the consideration of Bills. The difficulty was not, he thought, that the Resolution struck the organised and regular Opposition in regard to the curtailment of debate. The difficulty in connection with guillotining a Bill, and especially one of this character, was that the guillotine, rightly or wrongly, in practice prevented Amendments being moved. There was not the same liberty to move Amendments, and unless an hon. Member could persuade the Minister in charge of the Bill to accept an Amendment there was no discussion of it if it was not reached within the time allowed by the guillotine Resolution. He had personally to thank the Minister in charge of this Bill for meeting him and others in regard to points to which attention was directed on the Second Reading. The difficulty to his mind in regard to the guillotine was that it stopped Amendments, and that was particularly dangerous in the case of a Bill of this description. Notice of Amendments, some of which he could support, had been given from more than one quarter of the House, and the House should have an opportunity of considering them. But the answer was that the course now proposed was inevitable. What else could they do? It was inevitable if the House were to sit for only a very limited portion of the year, and if the Government had a large programme, having regard to the fixed claims on their time for the discussion of Supply. It was impossible to deal with large measures in these circumstances except by the use of the guillotine. The discussions of Supply and on the Budget were making enormous drafts on the time of the House, and the only way they could make progress with other questions was by sitting through the autumn or by using the guillotine. Unless they were prepared to sit through the autumn, it was undoubted that they must continue to use the guillotine on every great Government measure. There was a tendency to extend its use, and the remedy was for the House to sit through a larger portion of the year. The financial considerations in connection with this Bill were material considerations. The right hon. Gentleman had truly said that the Government had not yet given the House a fair estimate in regard to the cost of their proposals. But the Secretary of State for War had promised to give a revised estimate before the House went into Committee on the Bill, and in reply to many questions from different quarters of the House the right hon. Gentleman had made statements which had greatly extended their knowledge and confirmed the view some hon. Members had taken on the Second Reading, that the scheme could not be put in force for the amount originally suggested. There would be under the proposal now made to the House an opportunity of debating more adequately some of the constitutional questions which lay at the basis of the finance, and of dealing with the criticism which had come from both sides of the House that the effect of the Bill was to strengthen the financial hold the Army Council had over the funds voted by the House for the Militia and the Yeomanry, and to weaken the control of the House, which had always been thought essential, by taking the finance out of the purview of the Comptrollor and Auditor-General and of the Public Accounts Committee. The alarm felt on this subject had been to some extent dispelled by the answers of his right hon. friend, but at the same time it was satisfactory that on the Report stage of the financial Resolution there would be an opportunity of discussing that question. The objection he had to take personally to this Resolution was not based on the financial aspect of the question or on deficiency of information. Some hon. Members made the same objection, from the point of view of finance, in the discussion in 1902 in connection with the guillotine proposals on the Education Bill. Those who had difficulties on many points of the Bill would be barred out from all opportunity of effectually amending the Bill in Committee of the Whole House, for no Amendment of any importance could be carried except those proposed by Ministers themselves. This was a Bill which would pass in another place; in fact, some of them believed that it had been drawn to be passed in another place. But if Amendments were to be made after this Resolution was passed, they would be Amendments passed not by the House of Commons but by the House of Lords.

MR. LAURENCE HARDY (Kent, Ashford) said that the Prime Minister, in introducing this Resolution, had informed them that it was a novel procedure; but the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten that the first attempt to apply it was in the case of the Plural Voting Bill last session, when, however, the Resolution was passed after the House had entered on the consideration of the Report stage. This Army Bill made a very large demand on the House in one peculiar way. Those who remembered the debate on the Second Reading would recollect that in the speech of the Secretary of State for War many changes were foreshadowed in connection with the right hon. Gentleman's original scheme. But at present not a single Amendment appeared on the Paper relating to these changes, and the House did not know whether the changes were to be made by the Bill or not. They were to be allowed at any rate a very narrow margin of time to discuss Amendments, except those which might be put down by Ministers themselves. It had been said that the Bill would not be passed without full discussion of the main merits of its financial and constitutional proposals. But there were interesting details in other and minor clauses of the Bill which should be considered by the House; and there was nothing in the Resolution which provided that those clauses should be discussed at all. On the allotted days all Amendments except Government Amendments would be swept away into the waste-paper basket. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean was perfectly right in saying that there were some points in certain classes of Bills upon which, if thoroughly discussed by the House, a different view might be taken from that of the Minister in charge of the Bill, not as a matter of censure on the Minister or Government, but from consideration of the various questions discussed. He thought that this proposal was one of the most dangerous innovations that had ever been introduced in regard to the procedure of the House. In the case of a Bill of importance the main principles were generally fully discussed on Clause 1 or Clause 2, and it was only after that that the guillotine was brought in. No doubt the Government were obliged sometimes to undertake the duty of curtailing debate, but if a Bill was non-controversial and did not raise great Party issues it seemed to him that it was a most dangerous precedent to introduce the principle of this Resolution, and the Opposition were entitled to enter a strong protest against it—all the more strongly when they remembered what had taken place during the past few weeks. During the debate on the new Rules of Procedure it was stated that no first-class Bills were to be sent to Grand Committees—that they would be retained for Committee of the Whole House, and that in the case of important measures sent to Grand Committees full power would be retained over them by the House. But under this Resolution the Government did not intend to give the House the same opportunity of consideration as would be given in the case of Bills sent upstairs. The Government gave evidence of that by the concession they made in regard to the discussion on Report stage of Bills which came downstairs from Grand Committees. He agreed with the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean that this Resolution would give a great deal more power to the House of Lords than they would otherwise have; and those who desired that the House of Commons should remain in possession of its full liberties could not accept the Resolution as it stood. He himself had put forward a scheme for the appointment of a Standing Business Committee of the House which should arrange the business of the House and draw up a time-table, but it was not accepted, although he thought it better than the proposals of the Government.

Mr. ASHLEY (Lancashire, Blackpool) thought that the case put forward by the Opposition against the Government guillotine proposals had been greatly strengthened by two speeches from the Ministerial side of the House. He presumed that the Army Bill was a measure of considerable importance, and no one could say that nine days were sufficient to enable it to be discussed and dealt with with deliberation and care. The Secretary for War had said that time must be given to the War Office in regard to the pattern of the new cavalry sword, but they had already taken a year to deal with that subject, and if they were to take eighteen months surely they could give the House greater time for the consideration of the entire reorganisation of the Army. He did not for a moment dispute that it was sometimes absolutely necessary to apply the closure automatically, especially in the case of a measure, such as the Education Act of last year, which excited keen religious controversy. The time came in regard to that Bill when the Government saw they must apply the closure, but he would ask the House to say whether in regard to this particular measure there had been any sign on the part of those who opposed any detail —very few opposed it in principle— of a desire to offer captious opposition to the Bill. It was a measure of great length, and if the eight and a half pages of Amendments were looked at, he defied the Secretary of State for War to say that any of them were captious or obstructive. They might be Amendments with which the right hon. Gentleman did not agree, but they were put forward by hon. Members to express their feelings, and it seemed hard that they should be debarred from bringing them forward. He had a proposal which had for its object that the Militia when they joined the Army should retain their territorial name. That might be an impossible proposal or one which the Government could not adopt, but he did not think it could be suggested that it did not deserve some sort of discussion and consideration. He did not, however, see how, under the proposed arrangements, it could ever be discussed any more than the new clauses of private Members. He thought some sort of change should be made in the way in which these guillotine Resolutions were brought in, and his hon. friend for Rye had a suggestion on the Paper that Mr. Speaker should appoint a Committee to allocate the time for the discussion of different proposals. It seemed to him that was an excellent suggestion, although it was somewhat hard that Mr. Speaker should have another difficult task placed upon him. Under the present system it was the people who were interested in cutting short discussion on the Bill—the Government—who allocated the time, and it was possible, having regard to human nature, that if they saw an Amendment down which might embarrass them and cause some of their supporters to vote against them, they should so arrange their guillotine Resolution as to prevent the discussion of that Amendment. He thought they ought to guard against that, and if they could arrange for an impartial tribunal to deal with the question of these guillotine Resolutions a great deal of the objection to them would be taken away. Under existing circumstances he should oppose the Resolution.

MR. WYNDHAM (Dover) said that there were really two questions before the House, both of which were great importance. The first question was the propriety of this innovation and of the Government bringing in a Resolution of this character before the Committee stage had began. With that phase of the Resolution the Prime Minister had in the main dealt with, but he had not touched upon the other question which he wished to bring before the House. In the main the Prime Minister had excused himself for the policy he was pursuing and said he would prefer other courses to this violent proceeding, but those who had heard the speech of the Prime Minister and the reply of the Leader of the Opposition would agree that they might leave the matter where it was as the argument was complete, and until somebody reinforced the Prime Minister's somewhat meagre statement he was content to leave it there. But there was another question, namely, that of applying this novel principle to this particular Bill and the manner in which it was to be applied. He thought they were entitled at some early stage of the debate to hear a speech from the Secretary of State for War, because he imagined that the right hon. Gentleman was the responsible person for thinking that nine days was sufficient time in which to discuss the Bill and for having allocated the days to the various clauses. This was a Bill to which a proceeding of that kind ought never have been applied. To have done so seemed to him to be somewhat of a wanton act on the part of the Government and one in which he was surprised to think the right hon. Gentleman acquiesced, because he had certainly understood from him in the course of the previous debate that he was in favour of discussing the Bill downstairs in this House and not upstairs in a Committee room. He also understood from the right hon. Gentleman that it was not unreasonable to hope that an amicable arrangement might have been arrived at. It had not come to his ears that any amicable arrangement had been suggested, although no doubt it would have done had such a suggestion been made. Personally, he would have been glad if such an arrangement could have been arrived at. Nine days were too few for the discussion in view of the magnitude of the proposals before them and their very far-reaching effect upon the military organisation of the country, and the allocation of the time was, in the opinion of the Opposition, inappropriate to the relative importance of the matters to be dealt with. Under such a Resolution it was impossible either for the Opposition or for the supporters of the Government who were interested in particular forces to bring certain definite matters of importance before the House. Therefore, the point was taken that it was not merely that the total number of days was too few, but that the time allotted to particular subjects made it impossible to peg an argument to one particular point when the Government were unwilling that such a point should be raised. Those who had superintended the passage of Bills through the House knew that the Government often gained in time and added to the beneficence of their measures if they disposed of certain issues before they proceeded to the consideration of other portions of the Bill; but when the House came to work under this iron rule it would be detrimental to their proceedings. They would not be able to bring discussions to a head, and matters of far-reaching importance would be passed without due discussion and without the possibility of being afterwards reviewed. They had no complaint to make of the right hon. Gentleman's treatment of the Bill in its earlier stages. He had told them over and over again that he was open to argument on certain points. The right hon. Gentleman went, he thought, so far as to say that he would entertain the idea of the larger portion of the men in the Militia enlisting in the special Reserve. That was opening a door which might lead to very large consequences. It would be a modification of the Bill which might reconcile him to its provisions far more than was at present the case. Was it to be said that before they knew the full power and value of that undertaking and the exact meaning of the right hon. Gentleman the portion of the Bill dealing with the subject was to be passed? Many other similar indications had been given by the Secretary of State in regard to which he (Mr. Wyndham) did not see how the right hon. Gentleman could do justice to the hopes he had raised if the House were to be bound by this iron discipline. As to the allocation of the time he also wished to pass some criticism. This Bill was somewhat of a draftsman's Bill, and was not a good Bill for displaying the relevancy of the subject matter. He ventured to think also the allocation of time was a draftsman's allocation and did not satisfy any critic of the Bill or any supporter of the Bill who wished to bring out a certain point. He thought he could make that clear. A day was given to Clauses 1 and 2 and another day to Clauses 3 and 4, and the finance of the Bill was to be discussed during those days. The financial aspects of these clauses and of the whole Bill were very important, and he was not sure that they could discuss them on the financial Resolution. It was always a matter of doubt, because that question was decided by the Chair with more or less elasticity. He did not understand that any body of opinion in the House was opposed to the right hon. Gentleman endeavouring to establish a Territorial Force which should be more efficient than the existing Volunteers, and the only two really important points embraced in Clauses 1 to 4 were questions of finance and of the value the nation got for its money. He marked in Clause 2, moreover, a tendency to go back to the danger of the old principle of the muster under which the officer got so much for the men he mustered. These associations were going to be given a certain amount of money for different purposes. When they were dealing with the allocation of money for the purposes of the payment of troops the only points which were had regard to were the number of men and efficiency. Those two important points were embraced in Clauses 1 and 4. Another subject of importance touched upon by the Prime Minister was the system whereby the right hon. Gentleman was going to divide the commands from the administration. It might be a good plan to divide these commands, but he doubted whether it was wise to have the two covering the same district. But important as those points were there was nothing in them that was irretrievable. If the right hon. Gentleman found that there were executive and administrative generals covering the same ground and that there was an excess of staff he could alter it. The right hon. Gentleman had given them a hint that he might find some stronger and fresh method of finance and some different system of administration. He made no complaint about the giving of two days to discuss Clauses 1 and 4, but he thought the right hon. Gentleman had favoured these clauses to the prejudice of clauses which raised points of equal, and even of greater importance, dealing with sound finance and complexity of administration. And, inasmuch as these questions involved the taking of steps which were irretrievable, their opinion was that the greater part of the time at the disposal of the

House should be given to these subjects, and that the House should be free to keep the discussion alive round these points of novel departure until it understood what the Government meant and was seen to be generally favourable to those intentions. The Secretary of State would be the first to deplore rushing the Bill through under these circumstances, because he would recognise that it had not the support of the nation and the country behind it, and, therefore, would undoubtedly fail. The present allocation of time rushed some of the clauses of great importance through in company with a number of others. During the early part of the Bill the only proposal bearing on this great issue was the sub-section of Clause 6, which gave power in regard to the turning of portions of the Territorial Force into bodies or corps and to amalgamate portions of that force with the other forces of the Army. That was a clause of such latitude that it would take three hours of close, reasoned debate to elicit from the Minister exactly what it was that the Government were asking leave to do. If the House was not under these rules the probable course would be to move, not as a dilatory Motion to waste time, to postpone that sub-section and put it back in the Bill among other clauses to which it was germane. There was this clause giving these powers and Clause 33 giving similar powers, and between them a whole lot of clauses dealing entirely with different matters. The proper way of procedure was to group the clauses and have a free debate during the remaining days, even if there was not to be a free debate of Clauses 1 and 4. He would sooner see Clauses 1 to 4 guillotined, and then as many days allocated as the Government could give to the rest of the Bill, so as to arrive at matters of first-class importance. The questions of first-rate importance were three: (1) that the training for war should be prior to the crisis of war; (2) in making provision for training these men they should not discard some of the men who were now trained more adequately than was proposed; and (3) if such provision was made, then the pay and the emoluments should be sufficient to get the right class of men for sufficient early training at a sufficiently early period. Those three points had never been put fully before the House, and they had never been understood nor assented to by the House.

MR. HALDANE said the right hon. Gentleman, in the course of his speech, made an appeal to him, to which he ventured to give the strongest response. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman about taking into consideration the great body of opinion outside as well as inside the House, but he was combatted by the right hon. Gentleman's own arguments, for not even the right hon. Gentleman during the course of his speech could prevail on the House to show that there was the least agitation prevailing about any infraction of the constitutional liberties of the House. Scarcely a dozen Members were present a short time ago, and everywhere there was an acquiescence in that attitude on the part of the House that the Government in acting thus was doing a sensible thing. The right hon. Gentleman had given a number of instances of various matters which, however, grouped themselves under two heads. First, he had indicated that the whole procedure was an innovation, which was admitted, and the second was that the time allotted was too short for the Bill. What were the circumstances? The Bill had not only been debated at some length on the introduction and the Second Reading, but there had been a great deal of discussion as to the Army on the Estimates. They were now discussing the reorganisation of the Territorial Forces and the provision for wastage of war by means of the new third battalions. The latter part of the Bill merely conferred certain powers of administration which might be used or not. But when a Bill came up for consideration in Committee it came before the House as a broad scheme of administration whose principles had received the general assent of the House. All the Bill did was to leave the Government the requisite power to carry out a plan of organisation which had already been debated by the House. He was sorry he had not made himself clear about the Artillery. What really happened was that he had laid down certain plans and time was required to carry those plans out. He was at work on them, but he had not taken a single man off the Artillery yet. Whether it was so, or whether it was not so, was a matter left wholly untouched by any clause of the Bill which they had to consider.

Therefore, he thought they might leave the Artillery when they came to the allocation of time in Committee. It was the same with all questions of general principles of that kind. When they got to the last part of the Bill to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred, they had followed the precedent which had been observed in Bills in regard to Army reorganisation in the past. Literally and strictly two-thirds of the topics discussed on the First and Second Readings were irrelevent when they came to deal with this Bill in Committee, and that was one of the things which he had in his mind when he made this allocation of time. As to the question of associations, he thought it a very important one, and that there would be a great deal of discussion upon it; but there were two or three broad principles which could easily be compassed in the course of a single day. The Bill had been very carefully drafted and matters had been arranged in such a fashion that they had been able to bring them within the compass of the allocation. The second day's work dealt with questions of finance, and again he would make the observation which he had made before, that the Bill did not refer to the way in which the financial machinery was to be worked out. He had promised his right hon. friend the Member for the Forest of Dean to lay a statement upon the Table of the House before they went into Committee, or on going into Committee, on that point. He would do so only to show the fashion in which the Government contemplated using the administrative powers arising under the clause. They meant to preserve the financial control of Parliament, and the Bill did not touch the question one way or the other. When they came to the parts of the Bill which they would be discussing in the next two days, as the Prime Minister had said, they would be discussing things most of which were in the present rules of the Volunteers, and the other matters were simply reproductions of the clauses in the Yeomanry and Volunteer Acts. The whole importance of the matter was how they would use these powers, and that would come up in future for discussion, because if this system were adopted, a Vote for the Territorial Force would be put down each year on which the arrangements for the year would be subject to the review of the House of Commons. The hon. Member for Ashford, who was a very great authority on this matter, had been misled by the notion that in the Committee stage on the Bill all those questions which had been discussed in connection with the scheme, the number of adjutants and the pay of the Artillery forces, and all those topics which belonged to administration, would come up on the clauses; but if they read the Bill they would see that beyond the principle of organisation nothing else appeared in the Bill. Once they passed the Second Reading, and they had passed that stage, they had disposed of such questions as whether the Militia, Volunteers, or Yeomanry were to be separate bodies. That was essentially a Second Reading question, and when the House had passed the Second Reading by a majority of over three to one against the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment it must be taken that the House had assented to the broad principle that they were to organise on a two-line and not on a three-line basis. If that were so, it was plain that they could not discuss that Second Reading point again and again on the clauses.

Mr. WYNDHAM was understood to ask a question about the Militia joining the third battalions.

Mr. HALDANE said the Militiaman like everybody else could be enlisted in the third battalions, into the special reserve, and thereupon he would become liable to go abroad. He would be very glad to see individual Militiamen enlist into these third battalions, and to see their officers joining the reserve of officers. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover misunderstood him if he thought that he suggested that the Militia was the unit which would become the third battalions.

Mr. WYNDHAM was understood to state that under certain circumstances 250 of one battalion of Militia would be accepted for the Reserve.

Mr. HALDANE said he would be only too pleased to have 250 Militiamen individually; more than that, he would take 500 if he could get them. All he asked was that they should enlist individually. It would be all the better if they had an influence upon each other, and if they could bring in a reserve of officers whom they could use for the purpose of training. That was nothing new; it had always been a part of the plan. They had not tried to make it difficult for people who served in the Militia to take a new part in the organisation of the Army. On the contrary, they had tried to make it as easy as they could, and they would continue to try to make it easy. The only relevance of that observation was for the purpose of pointing out that this question of the Militia joining the third battalions was not prejudiced one way or the other by the last part of the Bill to which the right hon. Gentleman referred. This Resolution was doubtless an innovation, but he hoped that it would be the beginning of a more sensible course which not only this Parliament but future Parliaments would follow. He thought it would be enormously better that they should try to make a better distribution of their time in future. He quite agreed that it would have been better if they had had machinery ready to hand to do it now; but that not being so, and the principle being one which they believed the majority of the House were agreed upon, they had done their best in the matter. The misapplication of the time of Parliament was becoming a scandal. He was responsible for the allocation of time; he might have erred, but if he had erred it was *bona fide*. He had tried to do his best to parcel out the time allowed in a way that seemed to him to be fair. At first he thought that five days would be enough, and he still thought so, but he had allowed six in order to leave a magin. He thought, knowing the inside of the Bill, that full time had been left, bearing in mind the discussions which had taken place on the First and Second Readings with regard to the principles of the measure, and that they had now only to deal with the powers which depended on those principles. His mind would not be rigidly closed to suggestions in Committee. They wanted to make the best Bill they could out of this, and consequently he hoped it would be found that they were open to suggestions. But it followed that in order to make the best use of the time before them it was necessary to provide in some fashion for its distribution. He admitted with his right hon. friend that this allocation of time was a new practice, but he hoped that in future it would be very fruitful, not only to hon. Members on that side of the House, but to hon. Members on the other side.

*MR. J. RAMSAY MACDONALD (Leicester) said he did not rise for the purpose of making any complaint regarding this innovation; he thought that every Government in the time to come in that House would require to ask for powers such as were now being asked for. But what he would suggest was that the Government in allocating the various days for the consideration of the Bill had been a little bit niggardly. The fact was that if this scheme was carried, not a single Amendment would have the slightest chance of being passed unless a private Member had been successful in persuading the Minister for War that his Amendment was necessary. The vicious part of the scheme was that it took away from the House its power to amend the Bill and placed it in the hands of two Gentlemen who conferred together behind Mr. Speaker's Chair or in any other private place. He felt certain that the right hon. Gentleman did not mean to do anything of the kind. Those whom he (Mr. Macdonald) represented had several Amendments that they would like to put down; but they were all economists, and they wanted to serve the national finance. Now really why should they take the trouble to put down those Amendments? not a single word of them would be discussed. At any rate the more important of them would not be discussed under this scheme, and it was simply wasting public money to add to the agenda paper Amendments which they knew there would be no possible chance of considering. There was another very important consideration, and it was the fact that this scheme would take away considerably the authority of this House. Right hon. Gentlemen opposite when they were in Opposition used to protest very loudly against handing over the authority of the House to the Cabinet. He ventured to suggest that under this scheme they were handing over more of the authority of the House to the Cabinet. The defence which the right hon. Gentleman had made for this proposal seemed to him to be very inadequate. He had told them that the principle of the Bill had been accepted on the First and

Second Readings, and that was perfectly true. He regretted that the new Standing Orders were not put in operation with regard to this Bill. There were certain clauses, not of detail which followed from certain general principles which had been accepted, but of principle, and they ought to be fully discussed. The better course would have been for the more detailed clauses to have gone upstairs to one of the Standing Committees, and those other clauses to have remained for further discussion in the House. The first three clauses contained matters of principle which were not discussed on the Second Reading. There were certain provisions in Clauses 2 and 4 which hon. Members voted for on the understanding that they would be able to move Amendments so as to change those clauses, not only in detail, but in regard to their scope. There was, for example, the relation between the county associations and the Universities. That involved a great political principle. Then there were the provisions with regard to cadet corps. That was a question that was not a matter of detail following by logical necessity upon the principle accepted on the Second Reading. Those were matters of great political and civil importance which the House as a whole ought to discuss and decide upon a definite Amendment and not merely upon the general debate. They wanted some explanation of the sub-section dealing with county associations and Reservists and ex-soldiers. They wished to know what the right hon. Gentleman had in his mind when he put that sub-section in the Bill. But Clauses 1 and 2 were going to be dealt with on one day. Clause 1 dealt with the question of county associations, and when that subject came on there would not be much chance to discuss anything else on that day. In Clauses 3 and 4 the important financial provisions were placed in the forefront, so that neither on the first nor the second day would they have an opportunity of discussing that very fundamental point of the relation between the civil life of the country and its military organisation. The right hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that behind him there were very strong opinions held on these points, and there was also a very strong feeling upon them outside the House. He suggested to the right hon. Gentleman that they ought to have a day for discussing the county associations, and the next day might be devoted to a discussion of the very important alteration proposed in regard to the civil relationship of the people with the military force. He did not desire to embarrass the Government in regard to this guillotine Resolution; in fact the Labour Party would assist them in carrying it; but he hoped that the Secretary for War would meet them on the points he had raised, namely, those of civil and political importance, which were not matters of detail, but of principle, which ought to be discussed more fully in the House, upon which there ought to be a sort of *ad hoc* discussion and not merely the discussion of general principles which took place when the Government got such a big majority on the Second Reading.

LORD R. CECIL (Marylebone, E.) moved as an Amendment to the Prime Minister's Motion, "That it is inexpedient that any further resolutions dealing with the allocation of time for particular Bills should be passed except as part of a general system by which the liberties of this House shall be properly safeguarded." He said the speech they had just heard from the hon. Member for Leicester displayed the attitude with which the Secretary for War seemed disposed to approach this matter. There were under this scheme very serious principles which would have to be discussed. The War Secretary had referred to the indifference of the House to the question of the general principles involved in the Resolution and he seemed to regard that indifference with some satisfaction. He admitted that the Ministerial side of the House at any rate seemed very indifferent whether this new departure in their procedure were carried or not, but the War Minister and the Prime Minister were evidently under no delusion as to the magnitude of the change that was being made in the procedure of the House of Commons. It was not only that it was the first time the guillotine had been applied before there had been even an attempt at discussion in Committee, but it was the nature of the Bill to which the guillotine was being applied. No one had suggested that the discussion on the Second Reading was unduly prolonged. There was a strictly relevant discussion taken part in by hon. Members equally on both sides of the House, and he was at a loss to understand what the Prime Minister meant when he said that the proceedings in the House might be made the means of impeding the progress of business. He did not think such a suggestion ought to have been made in view of the way the Opposition had treated this Bill up to the present. It was undoubtedly a measure which ought to be submitted to the free and unfettered discussion of the House of Commons. If the House of Commons sanctioned this Resolution it would deliberately lay down that for the future all discussions upon important Bills should be carried on under similar arrangements. What effect would that have upon the Constitution of the country? It meant transferring the power of legislation from the House to the Cabinet. That was what the House was doing, and it was being done with the assistance of the votes of the Liberal Party. As had already been pointed out by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean one result of that would be to increase the necessity for a Second Chamber to deal with measures which were passed *sub silentio* in this House. The proposed procedure meant the gradual extinction of the unofficial Member. If hon. Members would consider the Parliamentary history of the last century they would conclude that this was the greatest change that had come over the House of Commons. In 1784 when Pitt was returned by a popular mandate with a great majority, and when he enjoyed immense popularity, he was utterly unable to pass through the House of Commons any measure unless it had obtained the reasonable assent of the House. That was the case right down to the time of Mr. Gladstone, and except on certain questions the House of Commons constantly took its own line, as hon. Members were allowed to vote for what they thought right and not simply for what the Cabinet thought right. The change might be partly due to these Resolutions and partly to other causes, but while it no doubt affected the Opposition it affected hon. Members on the Government side even more. It utterly deprived them of all power of producing the slightest effect on the legislation of the country. They all knew that there were in the House of Commons many hon. Members who had great experience in administrative matters, but for any useful work they did they might be replaced by three or four hundred men selected from any street in the neighbourhood. They were merely and necessarily under these rules ministerial voting machines. The other great result was and must be that the whole of the debates in the House entirely lost their reality. What was the use of attempting serious argument if they knew that the Minister had merely to sit silent, that at the end of the evening the guillotine would be applied, and that the ministerial voting-machines would come in from the library and the smoking-room to vote down arguments which they had not been in the House to hear? It was really a very serious matter, and one which must be considered by hon. Members sitting, not only on the Opposition side, but in all parts of the House. He was convinced that unless something could be done to restore the reality of their debates and the independence of Members, the reputation and the *personnel* of the House would seriously suffer, and the result would be progressively to throw more and more power into the hands of the Government of the day, so that the proceedings in the House of Commons would become less and less important, and they would have destroyed that which they valued so highly—the representative nature of the Government and of Parliament. He felt that it was not only these Resolutions that had contributed to that position; it was much more largely, no doubt, the rigidity of the Party system. That was not a matter that could be dealt with by any Resolution of the House. It must be dealt with by some combined attack on the Party machine, and that must be by some Corrupt Practices Act or something of that kind. But these Resolutions did make the House of Commons a less independent, less real, and less genuine representative Assembly and less able to reflect the opinion of the people of the country. He felt very strongly that if they were to have such rules the House should insist that they should not be a kind of Act of Attainder against Parliamentary freedom on particular measures. They should have a general system or plan of dealing with discussions in the House and applying to all measures, but not applied at the will of the Government to a particular form of coercion, or to a particular Bill. Whether the best plan would be by means of a Committee of Business, which would settle at the beginning of each session or of each measure the particular amount of time to be allotted to that measure, or by some other plan, he was not quite certain, and he did not ask the House to express any opinion as to what the precise plan should be. His own inclination was to believe, not that a Committee of business was the right solution, but that some greatly extended power should be conferred upon Mr. Speaker with the view of curtailing unnecessary and useless debate, which was not really advanced in the interest of any object which was legitimately desired by any Member of the House. He himself thought that what would be more useful than a Committee of Rules, or an extended power of closure conferred on the Speaker, would be the restoration to Members of their Parliamentary self-respect, the re-creation of independence of hon. Members, so that they could appeal with some hope of success by reason and argument to hon. Members who constituted for the time being the majority of the House. He begged to move.

MR. MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes), in seconding, thought that it was universally recognised by all on the Opposition side of the House that the Secretary of State for War was the last man to wish that the discussion on his proposals should be unduly curtailed. A good many of them knew that he was conscientiously desirous that his Bill should receive all the consideration due to so important a measure. And further they acknowledged that so eminently fair was his nature that least of all the Members of the Cabinet was he likely to have assented to these closing proposals as part of a policy of forcing a number of undiscussed Bills through the House of Commons with a view to bombarding and confounding the House of Lords. The time allotted for the discussion of the various stages of this Bill might be adequate or inadequate. To the Opposition, naturally, it appeared that, in comparison with guillotine proposals on other measures, the allotted time erred on the side of inadequacy. But however that might be, that was not the question raised by the Amendment. The noble Lord who proposed the Amendment and they who supported it wished to give the House of Commons the opportunity of declaring that these Resolutions dealing with the allocation of time for different stages of particular Bills were a hand to mouth expedient, and an unsatisfactory method of dealing with the difficulty. They wished the House to declare that it was time that the difficulties were properly faced. They wished for a declaration that the duty of laying down general rules in this connection, applicable to all Bills, should no longer be shirked. The Prime Minister in the course of his speech had taken great credit to himself for the improvement in his guillotine methods, but he (Mr. Mildmay) could see no improvement. The only change was that the guillotine was proposed at an earlier date and was to be more drastic in its action. The Prime Minister had described in his speech how they had been in the habit in the past of floundering through the first half of a Bill and scrambling through the second half. The process was to be very little changed; in future, it appeared, they were to scramble through the whole of the Bill. Luckily this was not a measure which, so far, had been provocative of violent Party antagonisms. Most devoutly did he hope that hon. Members would not allow it to become so. But let them take the two Education Bills which of late years had been carried through the House of Commons by both Parties. Could the guillotine Resolutions in connection with either of those Bills have been discussed under circumstances more fatal to the fair and dispassionate settlement of a time-table? Governments in the past had been in the habit, first of introducing a Bill, perhaps a very controversial Bill, and then, after days of heated discussion thereon, when full play had been given to Party bitterness, when the Members of the House were all on edge, coming down to the House and trying to force through a Resolution curtailing debate on the remaining stages to an extent which invariably appeared to the Opposition to be wholly unjustifiable. The necessity of doing something to cope with the excessive discussion on the Committee stage must have been recognised by all. Many years ago the Leader of the Opposition had said—

> "It is absolutely necessary to do something to curtail the efforts of those who desire to deal with legislation not by arguments, but by obstruction."

The power of applying the closure had been effectual in preventing undue discussion on the First, Second, and Third Readings of Bills. But it was not effectual at the Committee stage. They all knew that a Bill could be swamped by the weight of Amendments. The closure applied to each Amendment was an impossible way of coping with the difficulty. But, on the other hand, every fair-minded Member of the House must admit that closure by compartment was a most clumsy expedient and quite indefensible, because under such schemes most important Amendments, and most vital provisions of the Bill might go undiscussed. The fact that there had been or was likely to be obstruction did not condone the wholesale slaughter of Amendments good, bad, and indifferent. Then there was another argument which ought to weigh heavily with the supporters of the Government. Let them consider how closure by compartments so repeatedly employed had over and over again proved the usefulness and, indeed, the absolute necessity of the House of Lords. That must, he thought, be very distasteful to hon. Gentlemen opposite. He would put it to them, would it have been possible to guillotine the greater part of the second Home Rule Bill, to force the greater part of that Bill through the Committee stage without any discussion at all, but for the fact that the House of Commons knew that the House of Lords was behind it? Let them take a less ambitious measure—the Education Bill which was passed through the House of Commons last session. Was he not right in saying that largely, if not wholly, in consequence of the curtailment of debate in the House of Commons the Government Amendments passed in the House of Lords to their own Bill had bulked more largely than all the Amendments carried by the Opposition in that House? They knew the debates on these guillotine proposals so perfectly well. Each side always accused the other of being a worse offender than itself in the past. The same *tu quoque* arguments were repeated, there were the same recriminations which tired those who had listened to them for twenty years past. The Government had a large majority in the House; he appealed to them to take their courage in both hands and to tackle the question. It was not an easy question to tackle. Mr. Speaker might be unwilling to assume a greater responsibility than the heavy responsibility which was already his. But if he were willing to give to the Government his valuable help and advice in this connection, and if the Government approached the consideration of the question with an earnest desire to act in accordance with the general feeling throughout the House, he thought that it ought not to be impossible to improve upon the present guillotine methods of dealing with the difficulty, which methods must be so unsatisfactory, and, indeed, so repugnant to all who had the efficiency of the House at heart.

Amendment proposed—

> "To leave out all after the word 'that' to the end, in order to add the words 'it is inexpedient that any further Resolutions dealing with the allocation of time for particular Bills should be passed except as part of a general system by which the liberties of this House shall be properly safeguarded.'"—(*Lord R. Cecil.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'the Committee stage and Report stage of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill,' stand part of the Question."

*MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said he had a good deal of sympathy with the observations which had been made upon this matter by the hon. Members who moved and seconded the Amendment. Like all Members who had known what it was to sit in Opposition, and to be part of a small minority, he did not like guillotine Resolutions. But under existing methods of doing business they could not be avoided by any Government. They were a kind of a Government net to catch the torpedoes of the Opposition, and if they did not use their powers they would fall into disgrace through having their Bills and schemes destroyed. The principal object of an Opposition in the House of Commons, as a matter of fact, was twofold: first to turn out the Government of the day as speedily as they could; and secondly, to prevent the passage of as many Government Bills as possible which, to them, were obnoxious. It did not matter whether it was a Tory Party or a Liberal Party who were in Opposition. A Liberal Opposition would try to prevent obnoxious Tory Bills becoming law, and a Tory Opposition would try to prevent obnoxious Liberal Bills becoming law. In order to attain that end it was necessary for the Opposition to discuss measures at considerable length, and to occupy as much of the time of the Government as they possibly could, because in that event the fewer Government measures would be passed into law. For that reason he had never spoken of obstruction in a disparaging manner, as he recognised that under existing conditions it was a fair Parliamentary weapon. He well remembered that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham, speaking on a guillotine Resolution, with candour said that he had obstructed Government measures when he was in Opposition, and that when he was in Opposition again he hoped to obstruct again. He was not at all sure that the right hon. Gentleman was not correct in his employment of obstruction as a fair Parliamentary weapon. But in order to prevent these methods being successful the Government were obliged to pass Resolutions like the one now proposed, which also was a fair Parliamentary weapon. Let them never forget that the country, as a whole, did not mind how drastic their methods of closure in the House were; but what they wanted was that they should get their work done. He thought the Government should make some alteration in regard to guillotine Resolutions, because they seemed to have one for every separate Bill. He thought that all Bills ought to be read a second time early in the session, and then there should be a comprehensive Resolution with a time table which might be applied to them all. Of course, they must always protect the rights of minorities, and they should consult the Opposition with regard to the allocation of the time. The Government should say how many days they could afford to devote to a Bill and ask the opinion of the Opposition as to the manner in which they should be allocated. He was inclined to think that any Opposition which understood its business, as the present one did, would agree to such a proposition, as under the present practice the Opposition lost valuable Parliamentary privileges and opportunities. What happened now after a guillotine Resolution had been passed? The Opposition usually commenced, as soon as the Bill was brought in, to discuss some unimportant Amendment. Speeches were made on it on both sides of the House, it was often ended by closure, and no consideration was paid to the fact that at 10.30 the guillotine would fall. In this way the Opposition lost valuable Parliamentary opportunities. They lost the opportunity of making speeches on difficult and embarrassing Amendments. True it was that no one had much hope of converting the Minister in charge of the Bill by such speeches, but it must always be remembered that speeches in that House were partly delivered in order to influence opinion outside, and to lose the opportunity of making such speeches was for the Opposition a serious loss. Then, too, under existing methods they frequently lost the opportunity of making supporters of the Government vote on embarrassing Amendments. Such Amendments could be moved to almost every Bill, and to let supporters of the Government escape from voting was to lose a valuable Opposition opportunity. If, therefore, by means of a business Committee some such arrangement as he had suggested could be brought about they would at once see the end of obstruction. It would become an injury to the Opposition, and hence would speedily be considered bad Parliamentary form. And, as a matter of fact, they would never abolish obstruction until it became bad Parliamentary form. So far he had dealt with the matter from a purely Party point of view, but of course there was a much higher point of view, that of the public service. In the interests of the country it was advisable that every difficult point of importance should be debated across the floor of the House. When obstruction was ended, that could be done, legislation would be better and the influence of Parliament would increase.

MR. BOWLES (Lambeth, Norwood) said that the hon. Member for Barnstaple had made an exceedingly shrewd and valuable contribution to this extremely important discussion. The hon. Member had admitted that Resolutions of this kind were an abuse, but he had defended them on the ground that in the present state of business some such resort as the guillotine was necessary to any Government in power. The hon. Gentleman had said that he had never spoken disparagingly of obstruction; and they on the Opposition side of the House were obliged to him for the statement, for they all recognised that the hon. Gentleman was a considerable authority on the matter. It was not very long ago that a very important Motion standing in the name of the hon. Member referring to a very technical question was, on the sole request of a single member of the Cabinet, no doubt to his dismay and consternation, withdrawn. The hon. Gentleman had said that such drastic treatment of the House of Commons was necessary because it was imperative that they should get on with their work. It was important to consider for a moment what was the cause of the confusion and what was the work which the House of Commons did. Was it that when the Government produced an important Bill or a certain mumber of Bills the whole work of the House of Commons consisted in passing them into law with the greatest expedition? If that was really the correct view of the function of this House, Resolutions of this kind were absolutely necessary; but if that was not their function then such Motions were absolutely indefensible, mischievous, and dangerous in a high degree. On the Opposition Benches they had recently remarked as extraordinary that in what he believed was called a democratic Parliament, under a democratic Government, the first action taken should be to destroy the House of Commons as a democratic body. That was a very significant and formidable state of things. The hon. Gentleman had suggested that the people of the country did not care about the deliberative qualities of the House of Commons, and that all they wanted was to have forced upon them without discussion through a muzzled Chamber the decrees of the Government. If that were true the usefulness of the House was entirely destroyed, and it became perfectly ridiculous for any man with any views at all to give up his business time and his leisure and to come and sit there merely in order to help forward the democratic desires of right hon. Gentlemen. The truth was that the function of the House was not merely to pass Bills but to pass good and workable measures, and he held that measures merely proceeding from the back rooms of the right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench and put through the House without any opportunity being given for really discussing them, would never be either good or workable in the real sense of those words, and would afterwards have to be amended or reversed, which would take up the time of Parliament in later years. He utterly disliked the whole of these proceedings, and he did not admit that it was necessary to limit even the total time which the House was to take in considering a Bill of this gigantic and fundamental importance. He believed it was only by letting the House of Commons "go" at a Bill of this kind that they would make a workable piece of legislation, arrive at a final settlement, and save time. But whilst on general grounds he objected to the Resolution, he was bound also to say that when they came to the particular divisions in regard to time he was even more confirmed in his opposition. The right hon. Gentleman had said he had given a great deal of trouble and consideration to the allocation of the days, so that proper time should be given to each point of importance. He (Mr. Bowles) was no authority whatever upon Army matters, and there was only one question in the Bill upon which he felt fit or capable to say anything at all, but that was an extremely important point. He referred to the financial Resolution and the financial portions of the Bill. The House would observe that according to the right hon. Gentleman's plan they were to have only the fag end of one day to deal with the financial Resolution, and the fag end of the next day to deal with the Report stage. What did these financial proposals mean? They set up an indefinite number of spending authorities having powers, also perfectly indefinite, over sums of money, which were evidently going to be enormous. The whole of the stupendous power in regard to these moneys was under the Bill to be given to the right hon. Gentleman. In his opinion the finance of the Bill would wreck the scheme in the end, and was the real danger and difficulty in regard to it; but apparently they were to have this tremendous financial revolution forced upon the country without any discussion in the House. The financial clauses might never be reached at all. That surely was not a proper allocation of time, and he was sure that the right hon. Gentleman would, in his heart at all events, admit that to make a change of that kind under these circumstances was to reduce the House of Commons in its most important aspect to a derogatory position, and to treat it with contempt. He disliked and distrusted the whole of this system of guillotine closure. He believed that it was totally unnecessary, and that arrangements could be made under which the House without provisions of this kind could exercise the great deliberative functions which were its great glory. It was not to pass Bills that the House of Commons existed, but to discuss them and to see that they were not ridiculous, unnecessary, and dangerous. The House of Commons was not there to support Parties, but to control and enlighten, and when these invaluable privileges were attacked, as they were by the Resolution before the House, he should always feel bound to resist proposals of that kind in general, and he felt bound to resist in particular these proposals, which produced a revolution in the character of the House, would go far beyond this present Parliament, and would have a far-reaching effect upon the legislation under which the country was to live in future.

Major SEELY (Liverpool, Abercromby) said his only excuse for intervening was that, in common with many hon. Members on the Ministerial side of the House, he wished this Bill to pass with unanimity, believing as he did that if it passed leaving any sense of injustice in the minds either of hon. Members below the gangway or of hon. Members opposite the House had better not pass it at all. The Bill imposed an obligation upon people who were not obliged to do anything at all, and if it were passed in a manner which gave rise to any sense of injustice its efficiency would be destroyed. Therefore he would not support the proposal of his right hon. friend if he supposed that it would cause a great grievance to hon. Members opposite. He agreed with the noble Lord opposite that the whole of these guillotine Resolutions were detestable, and it was a fact that the more guillotine there was, the more obstruction was provoked. It had been said by an hon. friend of his that there were three ways of governing a country: by bullets, by priests, and by talk, and talk was the best of the three, and so far as they abolished talk they would have to resort to other measures. But while he objected to guillotine Resolutions in general and this one in particular, he would urge upon right hon. Gentlemen opposite that the time given under this proposal was not really unduly short. He remembered they had in the last Parliament to urge the Leader of the Opposition to give more time for the discussion of another far-reaching scheme of Army reform. The right hon. Gentleman met them with extreme generosity, and took the scheme out of guillotine Resolution and gave them two or three days for the discussion. He remembered, however, the immense difficulty they had in keeping the debate going. The fact was that the number of Members who took part in Army debates was very small, and although when in Opposition they all protested there was not enough time given for them, when it came to the point there was a difficulty in keeping the debate going. It had been so in the past, and he suggested it might be so in regard to this Bill, if his right hon. friend were to regard this Resolution as being passed not as a law of the Medes and Persians, but as a thing which could be altered. He thought there was a precedent for that, and that similar guillotine Resolutions had been altered after they had been passed. He would urge his right hon. friend to meet the Opposition and give them further time, believing that the Bill could never be a success unless it was accepted by general consent. He thought, however, that when it came to the point there would be ample time for discussion.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR thought there was much sound sense in what had fallen from the hon. and gallant Gentleman, but it was not so easy to modify guillotine proposals as he suggested. There was a method by which it could be done if the Government were willing parties to the transaction, for all guillotine Resolutions had in them the fact that such a thing was to be done on an allotted day, and if the Government desired to increase the length of time for the Bill, they had only to put down some small measure as the business of the day, and then afterwards discuss the particular Bill to which the guillotine Resolution referred. The flank of the Resolution was then turned. The hon. and gallant Gentleman professed to say that the difficulty of keeping an Army debate going was so great that six days were sufficient for the purpose. His own experience of the past did not lead him to take that view. He reminded the House that far larger questions were raised by this Bill than were ever raised by the former Army Bill to which reference had been made, and the time given for discussion was much shorter. The number of questions raised was very large, and he believed it would be found difficult to compress all the questions into six days, with the result that a great number of questions that the House most wanted to discuss would not come before it at all, but would simply be formally put from the Chair after the fatal hour of ten o'clock arrived. He could not agree with the Secretary of State for War when he said that, so far as this was an enabling Bill, it did not require very lengthened discussion. The House was not discussing this as an enabling but as a positive measure. If it was not a positive measure it was nothing. If it was not intended to create a great change let them not discuss it for six days. The Government had brought in a positive Bill in an enabling form. That, however, might be regarded as more relevant to many other questions than to the particular Amendment which his noble friend had moved. He proposed to vote for that Amendment. He had himself made proposals in favour of a general scheme, and that which seemed to find most favour was one giving to a Business Committee the power of allotting the time to a particular measure. The plan of a Business Committee, which should make a plan for the whole session, was one which he was afraid would be beset with great difficulties. He was far from ruling it out as impossible, however, and thought it well worthy of careful discussion. His mind had been rather turning in another direction. He had often wondered whether they could not make their debates really interesting and important by settling upon a series of propositions in connection with important Bills, which could be discussed *seriatim* downstairs on the floor of the House, the discussion in each case being stopped by closure; then the Committee upstairs, having been seized of the separate propositions, might be trusted to do the drafting part, the detailed and machinery part, and when the Bill came back to the House on Report it would be felt that all the essential elements had been discussed in the true and only theatre of debate, namely, the floor of the House, and with the full knowledge of the House and the public. In the Committee stage at present it was difficult for anybody outside to follow the course of the debates. The real thing which everybody who cared for the House—and nobody outside the House really cared for it—ought to aim at was to try and make their discussions both full and interesting. He had given a great deal of reflection to this problem, and, though he did not profess to have come to a thoroughly satisfactory conclusion, he was inclined to think the plan he had adumbrated promised the best results. He did not think the plan of throwing more responsibility upon the Speaker was a possible one. The House already threw a burden of responsibility upon the Chair which was almost too great, and he could never be a party to increasing the burden. And he thought there were great difficulties in getting the Opposition and the Government to agree as to the amount of time to be given to every Bill. Let them imagine a Committee at work on this Bill. The Secretary of State came down and said he had looked through the Bill with his draftsmen and was convinced that it could be discussed in six days. The Opposition said they could not do anything of the kind, there were many important points to be discussed, and it could not be done in the time. The whole thing would then break down. He believed they could arrive at some arrangement in this way. They could draw up together the propositions each side wished to have threshed out, and if that were done the debate on each proposition would be finished as other debates were, by closure if not by agreement. Having had to give some considerable thought to this whole question, both as Leader of the House and as Leader of the Opposition, he hoped the House would not mind if in a tentative form he threw out a suggestion, which he was sure was worthy of consideration, and which he thought would be more productive in the long run than any attempt to settle the matter by a Business Committee drawn from both sides of the House. Personally he thought the Government asked the House to deal with too many Bills in the course of the session; but if they threw upon a Committee the duty of deciding how long each Bill was to take, were they to take into account the general programme of the Government in regard to legislation or not? If they did not, how were they going to deal with the allocation of time? He believed his plan would give the House more freedom than it possessed now. A large number of Members who voted for the Second Reading wanted the Bill changed in really important particulars, and these hon. Members would never have an opportunity of asking the House to come to a decision on the matters in which they were interested. The questions would remain untouched and undealt with, or if dealt with at all they would not be dealt with within the walls of that Assembly. The situation was admittedly a grave one. Everyone must feel that each time one of these closure Resolutions was passed they were not fulfilling either in the eyes of the public or in their own eyes the functions for which they were sent there. They were sent there to debate and to discuss, and anything which curtailed debate and discussion *pro tanto* diminished their utility. He admitted in Opposition, as he had urged when in office, that discussion of details might easily go too far, might easily reach the point when, though not irrelevant and obstructive in the technical sense, it became wearisome and useless. But while admitting all this, he still thought that they could not rest content with these guillotine Resolutions, which were essentially an absurdity when applied to an Assembly the whole reason of whose existence was either to criticise the administrative actions of the Government or to deal with the details of the various legislative proposals which the Government or private Members brought forward. For these reasons he would show his sense of the gravity of the situation by supporting his noble friend in the lobby.

MR. S. T. EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid.) said the contributions of the right hon. Gentleman opposite in questions of this kind were always important and interesting, but they could not with any advantage discuss the proposal of the Leader of the Opposition on this particular Resolution, though he entirely agreed with him that something would have to be done in the near future if the House was to be an effective and efficient machine. But the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman would really add a stage to the proceedings on a Bill, and he did not think any of them desired to add to the number of opportunities for debate, for besides Committee upstairs, they had the First and Second Reading stages, and Report, which afforded ample occasions for debate. But surely the principle which underlay the proposal of the Government was the right one. It was the only time that a Member of the Government had proposed, before going into Committee on a Bill, a guillotine Resolution of that kind; but he believed that taking into consideration the matters dealt with by the measure it was a fair allocation of time. After all, there was not very much to complain of in the length of time to be given. It was surely better to proceed thus, than that they should discuss day after day the first clause of the Bill, and then find at the end of six or seven days that the Government had got only six or seven words of it. The result of that was that they did not get to the really important parts of the measure which everybody in the House desired to see discussed. He hoped it would be entrusted to the Procedure Committee to see whether anything could be done to devise something in the nature of a Business Committee such as had been suggested, which would give the House full and fair opportunity for discussion. The right hon. Gentleman had said that only Members of the House cared for the House of Commons, and that the country did not care for the House of Commons at all. That might be an epigrammatic statement containing some truth, but he thought it was true only in so far as the country had come to the conclusion that they were wasting time by constant and miscellaneous discussion. After all, it must come back to this—the conscience of every Member of the House to do what was right by Parliament in making not too long, or too frequent, but only what were necessary and fair contributions to debates, in order to get at the bottom of measures under consideration. As to the Amendment, he was not a little surprised to hear that the right hon. Gentleman was going to vote for it. It merely said that they must not have the guillotine Resolution on any Bill during the existence of the present Government unless they first of all agreed upon and brought into effect a proposal for dealing with the general business of the House. He believed a fair measure of time had been allowed for discussion of the Bill, and in the confident belief that the Government had taken the right course in proposing this guillotine Resolution, he would vote for it and against the Amendment.

MR. COURTHOPE (Sussex, Rye) said that as he would have no opportunity of moving the Amendment which he had on the Paper, he desired to say a word on the Amendment now before the House. He made no apology for intruding in a debate of this kind, because he felt that the Resolution went further than the Bill to which it applied and was no mere question of procedure. In his view it invited them to take part in the formal inauguration of bureaucratic Government, and even the youngest and least experienced Member of the House was justified in making a vigorous protest against the proposal of the Government. The Prime Minister had claimed that sufficient time had been given for the discussion of the Territorial Army Bill. He did not agree with him. But even if the time were sufficient, he still thought that they ought vigorously to oppose the Resolution, because the principle was the same whether the time allowed was sufficient or not. If in future discussion on all Bills was to be restricted, the Government of the day ought not to be the sole arbiter as to the extent of that restriction, because they necessarily looked at the question of the allocation of the time of the House from the point of view of their load of legislation, rather than from the point of view of the particular merits of the Bill. If, therefore, restriction of debate was to become an established thing, he hoped some such scheme as had been suggested might be discovered and adopted. Surely it was desirable that someone as independent as possible should decide the allocation of time on the merits of each Bill when it came before the House, and that not merely the amount of time should be given which the Government thought they could afford. The Prime Minister said they could spare nine days. On the other hand a Business Committee would look at the matter from exactly the other point of view, and would say what time should be devoted to this or to that clause of a Bill according to its importance. At all events, they would produce a much more equitable system than was contained in the Resolution of the Government, who kept the sole decision in their own hands. The Prime Minister had said that he was in favour of such a Committee, but that it was impossible to set up one this session. Why was it impossible? He did not see why it should be. The Prime Minister smiled. He felt that it might be somewhat impertinent of him to challenge the opinion of one of the Prime Minister's great experience, but he certainly thought that it might be possible for the House, without any long or serious debate, to set up an independent Business Committee. The Secretary of State for War had said that six days for Committee was sufficient, because the House had already approved of the general principle of the Bill on the First and Second Readings. This Bill dealt, *inter alia*, with the whole of the Auxiliary Forces, and practically placed them under a new organisation. The House knew how very varied were the conditions which prevailed throughout those forces. It must inevitably often happen that some of the particular points affecting certain regiments might seem unimportant to hon. Gentlemen in touch with some other part of the country. It might also happen that only a few hon. Members would be qualified to give a reliable opinion upon the points arising in a Bill of this character. It was of great importance, in order to get an efficient scheme, that those experts should be heard, in order that the result of their experience should be embodied in the Bill. The Territorial Army Bill was likely to be deficient and a failure as regarded individual regiments if those who held strong opinions on the subject were not afforded an opportunity of expressing their views. John Stuart Mill, in his work on "Liberty," said—

> "If all mankind minus one were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person than that one person would be justified, if he had the power, in silencing mankind."

He did not think one day was sufficient for the discussion of the financial Resolution. Important provisions like those contained in Clause 13 ought not to be left as one of the six or eight clauses to be discussed in a single day. He urged the right hon Gentleman to endeavour to find some system which would make the debates on this subject interesting and do away with the wholesale use of the guillotine. If the Government could not meet them in this way he hoped that some system would be adopted under which the guillotine might be applied in such a way that the Opposition would not feel that they were being robbed of opportunities of free discussion at the whim of the Government.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) said they had been told that the Resolution would destroy the efficiency of the House of Commons, which was being turned into a mere machine to register the decrees of the Government. The noble Lord opposite had said that if they took 400 members from the street and brought them into the House they would be able to carry this Resolution just as well as it was being done by hon. Members sitting on the Ministerial side. He wished to point out that there were many hon. Members who did not follow the Government just as they were told, and he had always voted according to what he thought was right. He wished to appeal to the House to consider this question from a business standpoint. He was sure hon. Members had been simply astounded at the deliberate waste of time that took place in the House of Commons. This measure had been considered in the House for eleven and a half days, and he would like to ask was there any Committee of business men outside the House which would have taken that length of time to deal with the subject. There were certain men in the House of Commons who talked upon every conceivable subject which came before them, whether they had any knowledge or not, with the result that the House was bored to death and did not want to listen to them. He might take the last speech they had heard as an example, because with the exception of the noble Lord opposite there was not a single member of the Opposition listening to him. If every Member of the House of Commons was to be allowed to speak on every subject, it would be impossible for the Government to get legislation through. What the country had returned hon. Members to the House of Commons for was not so much to discuss, as to pass legislation. If the Prime Minister went out of his way to give any more time he would disappoint his supporters who were of opinion that sufficient time had been allotted already for a thorough discussion of the matter.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 324; Noes, 84. (Division List No. 157.)

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E
Acland, Francis Dyke
Adkins, W. Ryland D.
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, John Emmott (Som'rs't
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Blake, Edward
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Branch, James
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Buckmaster, Stanley O.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sidney Charles
Byles, William Pollard

Cairns, Thomas
Cameron, Robert
Campbell-Bannerman,SirH.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, RtHn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Clancy, John Joseph
Clarke,C.Goddard(Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Coats,SirT.Glen(Renfrew,W.)
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies,M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dickinson,W.H.(S.Pancras,N.
Dillon, John
Dobson, Thomas W.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan,C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn,A.Edward(Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall)
Elibank, Master of
Ellis, Rt. Hon. John Edward
Erskine, David C.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Faber, G. H. (Boston)
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fullerton, Hugh
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glendinning, R. G.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood,G.(Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon.Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt.Hon.Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt.Hon. Lewis
Hardy, George A. (Suffolk)
Harrington, Timothy
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazelton Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert,ColonelIvor(Mon.,S.)
Herbert.T.Arnold(Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holden, E. Hopkinson
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hyde, Clarendon
Idris, T. H. W.
Illingworth, Percy H.
Jackson, R. S.
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,William(Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kennedy, Vincent Paul
Kilbride, Denis
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King,AlfredJohn(Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb,EdmundG(Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H.(Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law,Hugh A.(Donegal,W.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever,A.Levy(Essex,Harwich
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George,Rt.Hon.David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R.(Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M(FalkirkB'ghs
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill,JohnGordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh,Charles(Donegal,E.)
M'Crae, George
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
M'Kean, John
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston
Marnham, F. J.
Meagher, Michael
Meehan, Patrick A.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan,J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Nicholson,CharlesN.(Donc'st'r
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, John (Kildare, N.)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Dowd, John
O'Grady, J.
O'Kelly,James(Roscom'on,N.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert(Staffs. Leek)
Pearce, William (Limehouse)
Pearson,W.H.M.(Suffolk,Eye)
Philipps,Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps,OwenC.(Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price,C.E.(Edinb'gh,Central)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea,Walter Russell(Scarboro'
Redmond,JohnE.(Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rees, J. D.
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards,T.F.(Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts,JohnH.(Denbighs).
Robertson,RtHnE.(Dundee)
Robertson,SirGScott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roche, John (Galway, East)
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel,HerbertL.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott,A.H.(AshtonunderLyne
Sears, J. E.
Seddon, J.
Show,Rt.Hon.T.(HawickB.)
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James

Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth,ThomasF.(Leitrim,S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Strauss, E. A. (Abingdon)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor,TheodoreC.Radcliffe)
Tennant,SirEdward(Salisb'ry
Thomas,Abel(Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,SirA.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E
Tillett, Louis John
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker,H.DeR.(Leicester)
Walton, Sir John L.(Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John(Stoke upon Trent
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason,Eugene(Clackmannan)
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
White, George (Norfolk
White,J.D.(Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White,Patrick(Meath,North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley,JohnHenry(Halifax)
Whittaker,SirThomasPalmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams,Llewelyn(Carmarth'n
Williams,Osmond(Merioneth)
Wilson, John Durham,Mid)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P.W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES.—Mr. Whitley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.SirH.
Balcarres, Lord
Baldwin, Alfred
Balfour,RtHn.A.J.(CityLond.)
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry,N.
Beach,Hn.MichaelHughHicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cave, George
Cavendish, Rt.Hon.VictorC.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone,E.)
Chamberlain,RtHn.J.A.(Worc.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,CaptainJames(Down,E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Duncan,Robert Lanark,Govan
Faber, George Denison (York)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Fletcher, J. S.
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, J.
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Hills, J. W.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hon.Col.W.
Keswick, William
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Liddell, Henry
Long,Rt.Hn.Walter(Dublin,S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Nield, Herbert
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Pease,HerbertPike(Darlington
Percy, Earl
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Rawlinson,JohnFrederickPeel
Remnant, James Farquharson
Roberts,S.(Sheffield,Ecclesall)
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sheffield,SirBerkeleyGeorgeD.
Smith,AbelH. (Hertford,East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Starkey, John R.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Warde, Col. C. E. (Kent, Mid.)
Wilson,A.Stanley(York,E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon.C.B.Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

MR. VICTOR CAVENDISH (Derbyshire, W.) moved to leave out the words "including the financial Resolution relating thereto." He was somewhat encouraged to hope that the Government would accept this Amendment. He understood that the argument in favour of including the financial resolution in the closure proposal was based on two grounds. One was that this was an enabling Bill, and the other that a great number of the points had previously been dealt with to a very considerable extent on the Second Reading. He did not think it could be claimed that the scheme, either in regard to the amount it would cost, or in regard to a matter which, to his mind, was much more important, namely, its form and purpose, had received adequate discussion in previous debates. At Question time there had been a certain amount of elucidation given by the Secretary of State for War in answers to the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean. He was sure the right hon. Gentleman would agree that the method of extracting information by Question and Answer as to the real proposals of the Bill was unsatisfactory, and ought not to be encouraged to any considerable extent. He and his friends were only anxious that there should be an opportunity for the financial proposals in connection with this measure being adequately discussed as a whole, and not in the partial or detached manner in which the debates had hitherto been conducted. The right hon. Gentleman had given them some reason to hope that he would accept this Amendment, for only that day he had stated in reply to a Question by the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean that on the Committee stage of the financial Resolution he would make a statement, and further that he would consider the possibility or desirability of laying a statement on the Table of the House. That, at any rate, was sufficient to show that the right hon. Gentleman admitted that the House of Commons was not yet fully apprised of the intentions of the Government with reference to the financial operation of the measure. He hoped, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman would be able to see his way to remove the financial Resolution from the operation of the guillotine. Personally he did not think that the discussion of the Resolution would take very long. He was very much in the dark at present, and while he did not wish hostilely to criticise the right hon. Gentleman, he wanted to know the exact nature of the proposals, how the accounts would come before the House of Commons, how they would be dealt with in the Committee stage, and how they would come before the Public Accounts Committee and the Comptroller and Auditor General. It was upon these questions that short explanations from the right hon. Gentleman would clear away many doubts and uncertainties which existed in their minds at present. It must be evident that if they followed the course laid down in this Resolution, to all intents and purposes it would be practically certain that on the Committee stage of the financial Resolution there would be no discussion, for it was to be taken at the conclusion of the first day. He did not know whether the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had been informed on the matter, but he did not think the House of Commons had been informed that it was the intention of the Government to take the Report stage at the beginning of the second day. It must be obvious to the House that the Report stage on such a Resolution afforded by no means an adequate opportunity for discussing it. Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen now sitting on the Treasury Bench when in opposition attached very considerable importance to the constitutional point of view, and maintained that the rights of the House of Commons should be safeguarded by having due time for the discussion of such Resolutions. It was the almost universal feeling that this safeguard should not be dispensed with unless there was grave and sufficient reason for so doing. The practical effect of the guillotine Resolution would be to exclude this constitutional check on the expenditure of the country which had been one of the privileges of the House Commons. He might be told that questions which could be raised on the Resolution could also be raised on the clause of the Bill. There were a good many alterations which he felt inclined to suggest to the Government by way of Amendments to that clause. He had hitherto refrained from putting an Amendment on the Paper because he did not know exactly what the Government proposed to do finally; and he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would be able to clear up this point, as there was a very general desire in the House that more definite information should be given. The Resolution, although technically not a part of the Bill, was yet a distinct stage in its passage through the House. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'including the financial Resolution relating thereto.'"—(*Mr. Cavendish.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. WILLIAM RUTHERFORD (Liverpool, West Derby) asked whether the financial Resolution, being a distinct proceeding, ought not to have a particular time allotted to it. Sub-section (*a*) said that Clauses 1 and 2, and the Committee stage of the financial Resolution were to be brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day. It was obvious if that reading was correct that the financial Resolution might not be discussed at all.

*MR. SPEAKER said he did not think that the fears of the hon. Members were well founded, since the Report stage of the financial Resolution must be taken first on the second allotted day. There was, moreover, nothing to prevent the House saying that discussion of any Bill should not be taken at all.

MR. HALDANE said that Mr. Speaker had anticipated his reply to the right hon. Gentleman opposite. The difficulty on which the right hon. Gentleman had dwelt was purely imaginary. The procedure was that Clauses 1 and 2, and the Committee stage of the financial Resolution should be discussed and concluded on the first allotted day. The Committee stage of the Resolution was a pure matter of form, because the whole thing could be discussed over again on the Report stage. Then Section 1 of Clause 3, in the Bill itself, must be discussed on Committee stage and also on the Report stage, which would serve as good a purpose for discussion by hon. Members opposite. Then there were subsequent sections of Clause 3, on which there would be an opportunity for full discussion on the financial proposals. That was the answer as regarded procedure. In respect to substance he had undertaken to make a statement in Committee, or to lay a Paper before the House—possibly he would do both—explaining the mode of working the finance of the Bill. He repeated what the Prime Minister had said, that it was the intention of the Government to apply to that part of the money spent through general officers commanding the Territorial Forces the strict rules of Army finance. When they came to the money raised and spent locally from the sums in the hands of the Volunteers the application of the Army Finance Act would not be so strictly enforced.

CAPTAIN CRAIG (Down, E.) said that the right hon. Gentleman had said that the financial Resolution could be discussed fully on the Report stage, but he had forgotten that all the time that discussion was taking place the other parts of the Bill on which many hon. Members desired to have a full discussion would be blocked. On questions involving expenditure of large sums surely it was important that the powers of control which the House had looked upon with much jealousy in the past should not be handed over to parties outside the House without full discussion. He had no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman had not fully realised how strongly feeling would run outside the House on this question of the disposal of the money. The right hon. Gentleman had said that if the Opposition would picture themselves as business men sitting down to work out the details of a Bill, the whole thing could be got through in a few days. He did not pretend to be a clever business man, but he thought that the Committee of business men would not at the end of six or seven days feel that they had done justice to it. The hon. Member for Barnstaple had admitted that the Secretary for War might have trusted the Opposition with the possession of a little common sense which would have led them to come to an arrangement for full and fair discussion. If the right hon. Gentleman was desirous that the Bill should go through in an impartial spirit, and be made a Bill good for the Army and good for national defence, he could not secure his object in a better way than by accepting the spirit of the Amendment just moved.

And, it being a quarter-past Eight of the clock, and there being Private Business set down by direction of the Chairman of Ways and Means under Standing Order No. 8, further Proceeding was postponed without Question put.

GREAT NORTHERN AND CITY RAILWAY BILL (BY ORDER).

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be now considered."

*MR. MORTON (Sutherland) on behalf of the Corporation of the City moved that the Bill be considered that day six months. He said that in 1902 the company obtained powers to extend their line from Finsbury Place to Lothbury. The Corporation opposed the Bill because the company proposed to build a station in the public way, in the improvement of which the Corporation had spent about £40,000. They held that the company should purchase land for their station. The power under the Act of 1902 to take land expired eighteen months ago, and the rest of the Act would expire in two or three months. He contended that the company ought to come to the House with a new Bill instead of asking for a renewal of the old Act. In 1902 a great point was made in Committee that the company were going to extend their line 400 yards into the City, but did not propose to charge any extra fare for that distance. [An Hon. Member: That statement was made in Committee and denied and disproved.] It appeared from the evidence that statement was made. Sir Charles Scotter stated that "his own idea was that the company would make it a twopenny tube for any distance" and they were not adding this piece of line in order to get an increased fare. The engineer, Sir Douglas Fox, also, asked whether "it would not be possible to charge extra fares on account of the railway going 400 yards further into the City," said he "should think not, but that did not mean that the line would not be a revenue producer." Again, asked whether they would charge any additional fares for this little bit of additional extension, the witness replied, "No, I should think not." It was therefore understood by the Corporation and the Committee that the company were not to charge any additional fares; but now they came and said that they proposed to increase the fare by one halfpenny for this 400 yards, or an increase of 25 per cent. The opinion of the City Corporation was that this company could not possibly complete these works, as they would want further capital to do so, and were not likely to get it, and because, as everybody knew, these tube railways were not paying very well. This line was what was called a contractor's line, the contractors building it and taking all the risk up to a certain time. The problem which the City had to deal with in managing the immense traffic was a very difficult one, and they always had to see that certain restrictions were placed on companies. They did not, however, oppose companies unnecessarily. In fact, they had been accused of too lightly allowing railway companies to come into the City. Railway lines in the City could not be worked without restriction. The main point, however, that he wanted to make on this occasion was that the company ought not to take this piece of roadway for which the City had paid about £40,000 to improve it for the benefit of the public. They certainly should not be allowed to take it without paying for it, but the Corporation did not want them to take it even if they did pay, because the Corporation did not want it taken away from the public. When the Bill was before the House a short time ago the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade urged that it ought to be considered upstairs, and the promoters endeavoured to make use of that speech. They had no right to do that, because the Board of Trade had their own way of communicating with Committees. The City objected to speculative companies promoting Bills for taking over property upon which the Corporation had spent large sums of money for public purposes. They insisted that such concessions should be properly discussed. The company had had these concessions in their pockets since 1902 to make use of on the Stock Exchange, and they wanted to get them into their pockets again; but Parliament had held over and over again that such concessions ought not to be granted to companies unless they intended to carry them out. They wanted to get the Board of Trade clause as to commencing the works within a given time into the Bill, but did not succeed, and, up to the present, though he did not know what would happen elsewhere, they had obtained nothing, and were to lose ground for which they paid about £40,000.

*Mr. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty), in seconding the Amendment, said he was not at all surprised at the objection raised to this Bill by his hon. friend who had for many years devoted himself to obtaining the best possible facilities for the travelling public. He objected to this everlasting asking for extension of time and concessions to railway companies in the interest very often of Stock Exchange speculators. They came to the House to get a Bill passed with no intention of carrying out the concessions obtained. The matter then stood over for five or ten years until the company could raise sufficient money from the public to carry out the project, at a cost, in this particular case, of an additional 25 per cent. on the fares as arranged in the original Bill—and that in the face of the evidence of Sir Charles Scotter and Sir Douglas Fox, the celebrated engineer, who distinctly stated that there would be no additional fare charged for this extra distance of 400 yards. It was a bad system to allow Bills to stand over for a number of years, and then to allow the companies to come forward and ask for extra benefits for themselves whilst giving less advantages to the public. He had not the slightest hesitation in supporting his friend. This was a system which must, in the interest of the public, be stopped, and the sooner it was stopped the better. It was a system that ought not to be encouraged, and if the Motion went to a division he should vote with his hon. friend. He hoped the Secretary to the Board of Trade would see that the public interest was protected.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. KEARLEY, Devonport) said that if they considered what had taken place within the last three months the House would agree with him that the hon. Member who moved the Motion might have apologised for taking up the time of the House in this way. On the 7th March, the hon. Gentleman, as the official spokesman of the Corporation of London, made a speech setting forth all his objections to the Second Reading of the Bill. Those were the precise objections he put forward before the Committee which considered the Bill in 1902 when these powers were originally granted. On that occasion the hon. Gentleman said the railway was of no use; that it would never be made, and would never be used if it was made. He on that occasion answered all the points of the hon. Gentleman and did not propose to go into them now. They were fully discussed by the House, which came to the conclusion that there was no ground for rejecting the Bill. The Bill then went upstairs and the hon. Gentleman, again as the official spokesman of the Corporation of London, submitted his evidence, and the Committee came to the same conclusions as were arrived at in 1902, namely, that the Corporation of London had not made out a case for the rejection of the Bill. Now, after the Committee had heard his evidence, the hon. Gentleman again came to the House and moved the rejection of the Bill and told the House that if he was not successful he would try again elsewhere. In a case like this, he thought a great corporation like that of the City of London, in doing what they had, were not treating the House with proper respect. He was afraid they had fallen into the hands of bad advisers. The junior Member for the City of London, the other day, when speaking on the Worthing Gas Bill, gave the House some good advice. The hon. Gentleman said that when a case had been heard and witnesses examined and cross-examined by counsel, he took the very strongest objection to the Bill being opposed in the House. The hon. Member for Sutherlandshire, with a pertinacity worthy of a better cause, asked the House to reject the Bill. For his part, and he said so plainly, he thought that was an abuse of the procedure of the House, and he hoped the House would show its sense of the action of the hon. Gentleman by rejecting the Motion.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil) hoped his hon. friend would take the same course as he took on the occasion of the Second Reading. The Committee, of which he was a Member, which considered this Bill carefully, considered it for two days, and the only opposition to it was that of the hon. Member. They gave every attention to his evidence, recognising not only his position in the House, but also that he represented the Corporation of the City of London, and had also paid special attention to London traffic. After giving weight to his evidence, the Committee, unanimously and without hesitation, passed the preamble of the Bill. They were fortified in their action by the fact that the Board of Trade approved the Bill and that it was merely an extension of the Bill of 1902. They recognised that the Bill represented a *bona fide* intention on the part of responsible men to make this railway as soon as they could find the money, and beyond that they also felt that nobody would be prejudiced by a delay of three years. Under all these circumstances, he hoped the hon. Member would withdraw his Motion, or, if it went to a division, the House would vote against it and support the Committee.

*Mr. REES (Montgomery Boroughs) said that if it was competent for the Member for Ross-shire to support the Member for Sutherland, it was competent for anyone who laboured for his daily bread in the City of London to give his views upon this Bill. He submitted that this was a case in which a few words might be said with advantage upon the raid of the Picts and Scots upon the Bill before the House. The opposition to the scheme had been a vain opposition, and had failed both on the Second Reading and in the Committee upstairs. He wished to take exception to what had been said with regard to those engaged in the promotion of the Bill. If anybody had the curiosity to look up the names of the directors of the company, they would be found to be men at the least not less respected in the City of London than the hon. Member for Sutherlandshire himself. As one who knew the City well, he desired to say that this extension of 400 yards would be extremely useful, and people who were in haste would gladly pay the halfpenny it was proposed to charge. These attacks, which occurred with surprising regularity whenever any railway Bill came before the House, were extremely detrimental, not only to the companies concerned, but also to the commerce and trade of the country. So amazed was he when the hon. Member made his first opposition to this Bill, that he asked an old Parliamentary hand what was the cause of it, and the old Parliamentary hand said it was probably due to the absence of third-class sleepers on the railway. He pointed out that the line was only 300 or 400 yards long, but his friend said "Oh! that would not stand in the way of the said Member," and then asked what the name of the company was He said the Great Northern and City, whereupon his friend replied, "Why did you not tell me that before. There is a Member of this House who opposes every railway Bill that has the word 'Northern' in it." He did not wish to take up the time of the House, but he observed that whenever railway Bills came before them they were always treated as if railway proprietors were rich people with interests altogether different from those of the taxpayer or of poorer people. The fact was that in most of the big railway companies 60 per cent. of the holders of stock held sums under £500, which could scarcely be regarded as a venial accumulation of capital. As regarded the perpetual reiteration of the alleged "monopoly" granted, the whole of the country was now mapped out like a gridiron; they could not drive in any direction without crossing a railway line, and underground, in London, there would soon be almost as much pressure and competition as above ground. What was the position? On the sum of £1,282,000,000 invested in railways the total return was 3·27 in 1905, during which time fifteen of the companies paid £21,000,000 in wages. He asked whether there was not really some point in that remark, because the figures showed whether or not it was wise to maintain or support this perpetual opposition to railway companies whose capital returned, on the whole, only 3½ per cent. Out of thirty-nine companies moreover which he had looked up, the stock of only nine stood above par. The hon. Member below him had spoken with indignation of the charge of one halfpenny for going 400 yards, though many of them paid a penny for going as far in their lives.

*Mr. MORTON said he did not speak with indignation; what he said was that they had promised not to make any further charge.

*Mr. REES said the amount was not a very excessive charge for going 400 yards. Were railway stockholders mere altruists? They got little enough as it was for their money. He asked whether it was fair that the Great Eastern, which did the most local traffic in London, should run its trains from Walthamstow to Liverpool Street at a cost of 3·7 per mile, and should get 3·2? The District Railway Company's average receipts from workmen's tickets was 0·65, while it cost the company 1·22 to carry the workmen, and that was about 30 per cent. of their traffic. It reminded him of the time when he was in California, and when he took a ticket to go across America. He was told that if he had only come a little earlier he could have gone across for nothing and got a bunch of bananas at the end of the journey. But that was the result of competition and not of ignorant and wanton depreciation. He did not know why people who put capital in railway companies should not receive some return. He submitted that it was an altogether wanton opposition to this Bill. These Bills were brought forward at a great deal of cost, and the works for which they provided were frequently thrust upon the companies owing to competition, and it was by no means certain that in such a case as this and in many such cases that they were going to reap much profit. In France the other day the Minister of Finance described the prosperity of the country as such that almost every person in it had some interest in the railway companies. He feared that was not a criterion of prosperity here. He maintained that this was entirely germane to the present discussion, and instead of regarding the railway companies as enemies it was far better to treat them as friends, as helping communication, and as spending vast sums on wages. The hon. Member below him had described himself as a representative of the City in this matter, but he was informed that the hon. Member carried everything he wanted through the City Council by mere pertinacity. When he brought anything in he stuck to it, and, others going away because they had other work or were tired out, he carried through a wearied and attenuated council his resolution, and then came there and said he represented the City. He was in the City the greater part of every day himself, and he did not hesitate to express his doubt as to the hon. Member representing the City in any shape or form whatsoever. But whether the hon. Gentleman represented the City or not, he did say that this 400 yards of railway was very much needed, and that the factious and oft-repeated opposition to it deserved to be described in stronger terms than those used by the hon. Member on the Front Bench.

MR. E. H. LAMB (Rochester) said he begged to take exception to the course adopted by the hon. Member for Sutherland. Without going into the merits or demerits of the Bill, he asked the hon. Gentlemen to withdraw his Motion, in the interests both of the Corporation and of the House. For his part he did not think that the hon. Member for Sutherland accurately represented the views of the City Corporation at this stage. Whatever was the action he might have desired to take in another place, he wished to say that the action of the hon. Member was most unfortunate, and, as another Member of the Corporation, he dissociated himself from him.

*MR. EDMUND LAMB (Herefordshire, Leominster) said that, as a Member of the Committee, he had examined this Bill very carefully, and he had come to the conclusion that this extension was very much required and would be of benefit to the public. The railway carried 16,000,000 passengers every year. This distance of 400 yards would make a great difference to people going to business, and the position of the Corporation was very difficult to understand. There was no alternative proposal to this, which he thought would be in the interests of the public.

*MR. MORTON said he did not wish to detain the House, and he asked leave to withdraw the Motion, but not at all because of anything that had been said behind him. He wished that people who spoke about the Corporation would be correct and read the Minutes in which it was recorded that the Corporation authorised the opposition.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot make another speech.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill, as amended, considered; to be read the third time.

CENTRAL LONDON RAILWAY BILL.
[BY ORDER.]

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

*MR. MORTON, in moving that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, said he had to oppose this railway Bill on the Second Reading because the Corporation had no *locus standi* before the Committee. The Bill proposed to confer powers upon the Central London Company in regard to their undertaking, and it was opposed by the Corporation, not because it did any work within the City, but because a necessary work which should have been included had been left out. As long ago as 1897 they were considering the question of subways in front of the Royal Exchange, and how they could be connected up with the railways. If they took the trouble to read the minutes of the Corporation they would find that in 1897, when this matter was being considered, they received notice that a station was about to be built at the corner of Lombard Street, also called the Bank Station on the City and South London Electric Railway. When the plans were submitted for that station they objected to them, and called upon the South London Company to connect up their station by a subway with the Central Railway Company's station, on the level of the booking office, and also a deep level subway. When the matter was being considered Sir Benjamin Baker wrote to them stating that the terms asked by the Central London Railway Company made the carrying of the Corporation's proposals practically prohibitory on account of the very large sum which they were asked by the Central London Company to carry it out. The Corporation eventually got the deep level subway connection which had been of great use to the public and the Companies; but not desiring to press the City and South London Railway too harshly they gave up for the moment their demand for the booking office level subway. In 1901 the Central Railway Company themselves came before the Corporation committee, and at that time they intended to present a Bill to Parliament to complete their circle as they called it. The Corporation thereupon told the railway company that they would not consider their Bill until they had settled the question of communication between their own line and the City and South London Railway and King William Street. Thereupon the company agreed to construct the subway, making only one condition, that the City and South London Railway should agree to it. They went so far as to submit a plan of this subway and the Corporation approved the plans and considered the matter settled. The position of the matter now was that although five years had gone by, nothing had been done to construct the subway. Those who knew anything about city traffic knew how necessary it was that everything should be done to make use of these subway facilities. A letter was written by the Town Clerk to the City and South London Railway in regard to this subway, and they replied that they had no objection to it, and nothing was said about their paying any part of the expense. Ever since the year 1902 they had been unable to get the subway built, and the reason the Corporation were opposing the Bill now was that the construction of the subway ought to have been included in the Bill as promised. He knew they argued that the construction was subject to a concession that another subway should be taken over by the Corporation, but that had nothing to do with the matter. Instead of constructing the subways as promised, the company now repudiated the matter altogether. The City Corporation were acting in the interests of the public, and he made no excuse for bringing the matter forward. He regretted to say that corporations got little sympathy from Parliament with regard to matters which were not personal to the corporations, and he was sorry that the Board of Trade had seen fit to attack them as if they had some personal interest in this matter. The first duty of the Board of Trade ought to be to protect the public against all these companies. When these consessions and monopolies were granted to railway companies it was assumed that they were not granted for the benefit of shareholders, speculators, or adventurers, and he hoped the Corporation of the City of London would get some assistance from the Board of Trade in this matter. He begged to move that this Bill be read a second time this day six months.

MR. SMEATON (Stirlingshire) formally seconded.

Amendment proposed—

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"—(*Mr. Morton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said it was the duty of the Board of Trade to protect the interest of the public, and he denied that they favoured companies. He thought it was very wrong of the hon. Member to make any accusation of that kind. The Board of Trade had a duty to perform in connection with these matters, and they always acted impartially, leaving their mind open and affording opportunities to both parties to state their grievances. They had always endeavoured as much as they possibly could to deal fairly with both sides. In regard to this Bill he had had the advantage of seeing the chairman of the Central London Railway and their solicitor, who had informed him that when they made their railway in 1897 they arranged for the construction of certain subways. But the Corporation of the City imposed that obligation on them and they had carried it out. They had also made a footpath under the street to avoid heavy traffic under the Mansion House. Further than that they had laid a subway into which all the water pipes, post-office wires, and other pipes were gathered together. The Corporation was the authority for underground pipes, but in regard to this particular pipe subway the Central London Railway were mainly responsible. In November 1901 the company lodged notices of their intention to carry on the existing railway to such an extent as to convert it into a circular railway, and they opened friendly negotiations with the Corporation of the City of London on the basis of getting the Corporation to take over the pipe subway in return for which they were willing to make the underground connection described as the King William Street subway. The basis of the negotiations was that a circular railway should be made, and if that was not done the negotiations were to come to nothing. They agreed to make a subway, and certain conditions were undertaken by the Corporation. The 1902 Bill for a circular railway was rejected by the House. At that time all the railway Bills affecting London were hung up in consequence of the appointment of the Commission on London traffic. He had read at considerable trouble the enormous amount of correspondence which had passed between the two parties, and he was bound to say that he saw nothing in it which would substantiate the case which his hon. friend sought to make. There was an undertaking to make a subway, with conditions. He knew nothing of the rights and wrongs of the case; he formed the opinion he had stated from the correspondence and from a paragraph in a letter written by one of the partners of the solicitors of the company, in which he said—

> "I have no hesitation in saying that there is not, and never was, an unconditional agreement on the part of the Central London Railway to construct a subway."

That was the impression which he got himself from the correspondence. Seeing that this Bill sought to extend the Shepherd's Bush end of the line by a few chains, he thought his hon. friend would be well advised if he withdrew his opposition at this moment.

MR. MOORE (Armagh, N.) said he believed he could speak on this matter with absolute impartiality. He congratulated the Parliamentary Secretary on the fair way in which he had put the matter. He thought the statement of the hon. Gentleman would convey absolute conviction, but for one circumstance, namely, that he appeared to have collected his entire information from one side only.

MR. KEARLEY: May I correct the hon. and learned gentleman? The Board of Trade have gone into both sides of the case in detail, and I have looked into both sides.

MR. MOORE said he was far from saying that the hon. Gentleman was wrong in the conclusion arrived at. He probably was right. From the statement made by the hon. Gentleman it occurred to him that he had only received the account of one side of the case. He accepted the statement of the hon. Gentleman that he had been to both parties. If he had not interviewed the Corporation, as well as the Central London Railway, although he might be right in the conclusion he had arrived at, it would be a conclusion arrived at on an *ex parte* statement.

MR. KEARLEY: I read the whole of the correspondence between the parties. I did not go further.

MR. MOORE said the hon. Gentleman had interviewed the solicitors of the Central London Railway, and as he understood he had had no communication with the representatives of the Corporation.

*MR. MORTON: None whatever; he has not consulted us in any way.

MR. MOORE said that was the only point which he thought defective in the fair statement which the Parliamentary Secretary had placed before the House. The hon. Member for Sutherlandshire had asked the House not to allow advantages to be given by the railway company in one part of London because of a breach of agreement alleged to have been committed in another part. He understood that was the entire case put by the hon. Member.

*MR. MORTON: That was the only way I could put it.

MR. MOORE said he was glad he had not misunderstood the hon. Member's remarks. Surely all this matter depended on a question of fact. The strength of the hon. Member's position depended on two things, first, that there was an agreement between the two parties, and, secondly, that the agreement was not carried out. The ascertainment of facts was a matter which this House left to be dealt with by Committees upstairs on the evidence brought before them. The question whether there was or was not an agreement was one which the House could not decide. If there was an agreement which the railway company had not carried out, the corporation could during the past six years have brought an action to enforce it before the Railway Commission or in the Chancery Division. The hon. Member had said that the Corporation represented the public. If this agreement was in the interest of the public, the Corporation had grossly neglected its duty to the public for six years in not taking steps to enforce it.

*MR. MORTON: May I tell my hon. friend that the Corporation had no sealed agreement. It is all contained in letters, and they had hoped they might trust to the honour of the company.

MR. MOORE said he did not think that a technical objection, that the agreement was not sealed, would weigh for much with the Chancery Division or the Railway Commission if equity was against the company. The Corporation had not attempted for six years to enforce the agreement. He thought, therefore, it would be contrary to the dignity of the House and ordinary fair usage between company and company, and man and man, if the House were to agree to the Motion which the hon. Member had made to penalise the company in respect of a dispute of such very ancient origin. He was quite prepared to agree to the Bill going upstairs in the ordinary way for examination by an independent Committee.

*MR. MORTON asked whether he might be allowed to correct a statement made by the Parliamentary Secretary, which was entirely incorrect?

*MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot be allowed to make a second speech unless it is merely a personal explanation.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (TERRITORIAL AND RESERVE FORCES BILL (ALLOCATION OF TIME)).

Postponed Proceeding on Amendment to Question, "That the Committee stage and Report stage of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, including the Financial Resolution relating thereto, shall be proceeded with in the following manner:—(a) That Clauses 1 and 2 and the Committee stage of the Financial Resolution be proceeded with and proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day; (b) That the Report stage of the Financial Resolution and Clauses 3 and 4 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day; (c) That Clauses 5 to 7 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the third allotted day; (d) That Clauses 8 to 12 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day; (e) That Clauses 13 to 27 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day; (f) That the remaining clauses of the Bill and the schedules, and any new Government clauses and any new Government schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with and brought to a conclusion on the sixth allotted day, and that the Chairman report the Bill to the House without Question put; (g) That two allotted days be given to the Report stage of the Bill, and that new clauses and Clauses 1 to 15 of the Bill be proceeded with on the first of those allotted days and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day, and that the remaining clauses of the Bill and the schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Report stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with on the second of those allotted days and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day.

After this Order comes into operation, any day (other than a Friday) shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day, or on which any stage of the Financial Resolution relating thereto is put down as the first Order of the Day, followed by the Bill.

At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business allotted to that day are to be brought to a conclusion, the Chairman or Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or schedules, he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the Day, or if that day is a Friday at 5 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not, on any allotted day on which proceedings or any business are to be brought to a conclusion under this Order, be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House.

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill (including the Financial Resolution relating thereto) stand as first Order of the day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion for adjournment under Standing Order 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause, shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate."—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)—

Which Amendment was—

"In line 2, to leave out the words 'including the Financial Resolution relating thereto.'"—(*Mr. Cavendish.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

CAPTAIN CRAIG said that in November, 1902, speaking on the question of the closure being applied to any financial measure, the present Prime Minister maintained that that procedure lessened the rights and privileges of the House of Commons and extended those of the Executive Government. If that was the view of the Prime Minister in 1902, they might be safe in saying that if the right hon. Gentleman had his own way the financial parts of this Bill would remain open for free discussion without having the guillotine applied to them. They recognised fully that in matters of this kind the Treasury would have the last word to say in regard to the distribution of the money from the Central

Fund which was to be allocated to the different Auxiliary Forces. What had to be decided in the future was most complicated, and ample time should therefore be given for discussion. If the Secretary for War would only persuade the Prime Minister to drop the Irish Council Bill, which Ireland did not desire, there would then be more time to discuss fully this important question, which affected the whole of the United Kingdom, its Territorial Forces, and the defence of its shores.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) said that discussion on the Financial Resolution, which entirely jeopardised the existence of the Auxiliary Forces, should not be curtailed. The debate ought to last two or three days. The criticism of the hon. Member for East Edinburgh and of the late Chief Secretary for Ireland had not been answered. It was perfectly scandalous that, when the expenditure of the taxpayers' money was in question, a time limit should be put to the debate. There was no precedent for it. He desired to protest in the strongest way possible against the way in which the Government were forcing the measure through the House by the curtailment of the privileges of Members.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said that the Secretary of State for War had told them that he was going to make another statement on the subject of the finance of the Bill, but the very frequency with which these statements followed one another was evidence of the confusion into which the Government had fallen. A Statement was of cardinal importance, and ought to be before the House and to have full discussion, which it certainly would not have under the proposed Resolution. He maintained that the scheme of the finance of the Bill had given, from the very start to now, an entirely wrong impression as to its cost. If such a statement had been put forward by a limited liability company, it would have been called a fraudulent prospectus. The right hon. Gentleman having given to the House and his Party the assurance that this new Parliament should scrutinise the finances of the country with the greatest care, he had not acted in accordance with his public pledges or private inclinations. The approximate Estimate was £2,750,000, but the Secretary of State for War apparently would not be held to that Estimate, but had come forward from time to time with certain proposals which would increase it. Therefore the Estimate which was laid before them was a delusion and entirely inadequate. At the last moment, however, the right hon. Gentleman had promised them a new scheme, and he only hoped that it would be explained more clearly than some of his other proposals had been. They did not want any vague approximation, but a precise statement of fact, which he thought the House of Commons was entitled to ask for. Therefore, he asked the right hon. Gentleman to let them have an opportunity of examining the scheme. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that half the points of interest could not be discussed on the Bill, but he did not think that it was his province to inform the House of Commons of that fact: it should have come from the Chairman of Committees. The right hon. Gentleman had said they could not discuss the question of adjutants, but if they could not discuss it on the Bill they could do so on the Estimates. He thought the right hon. Gentleman's proposal on this subject was one of the gravest errors into which he was going to fall, and therefore he contended that they should have a full opportunity of discussing it. It appeared to him that in regard to the financial portion of the Bill, the right hon. Gentleman was going to destroy, not only the control of the House of Commons but the control of the Treasury over hundreds of thousands of pounds—indeed, a sum which would amount at least to two, three, or four millions. That was a subject with perhaps the least Party aspect of anything connected with the Bill, but it was certainly one of the most important, and he was convinced that there were Members in every quarter of the House and of every shade of opinion who would deeply regret any action of the Government which prevented due discussion upon such a proposal for financial devolution. He thought it was a matter of immense gravity, especially as it was now admitted that the Financial Estimate was perfectly inadequate to the situation, and would not meet the whole of the liability in regard to the proposed Territorial Force. He therefore thought that they had a strong case for asking the Government to revise their decision, and he confessed that to his mind the speech of the Secretary of State was by no means convincing that the Government had done the right thing in this matter.

SIR F. BANBURY (City of London) hoped his hon. friend would not mind if he ventured to differ from him on one point. He had commenced his speech by saying, and he agreed with the noble Lord, that they had had sufficient memoranda from the Secretary of State for War. The noble Lord said that they had had fourteen of these memmoranda, but he should like fifteen, with time to discuss the last one. Therefore, he proposed to vote for the Amendment. As he understood the Resolution of the right hon. Gentleman, he proposed to take Clauses 1 and 2 and the Committee stage of the financial Resolution on the first allotted day, and speaking entirely as a taxpayer, and quite apart from the safety and the military needs of the Empire, he disapproved of the financial Resolution being dragged in at the tail end of an important discussion on Clauses 1 and 2. The financial Resolution certainly interested the taxpayer. He himself was not averse to paying what he considered to be a fair sum to maintain the Army, but he wanted to know before he was taxed that there was some chance of the money being properly spent. He understood that great military authorities like his hon. friend the Member for Sheffield and others, would take up the whole of the time of the first day in discussing military questions, and the result would be the taxpayer would have nothing to say in regard to the financial proposals. He had the greatest admiration for the right hon. Gentleman's *savoir faire*, but he thought the most difficult part of this Bill was the financial part, and that the Secretary of State had carefully arranged his proposals for closure by compartments so that the question which would meet with the greatest opposition from the greatest number of Members would not be discussed at all. That might be all very well from the point of view of the right hon. Gentleman, but it was not all very well, but very ill, from the point of view of the taxpayer. He therefore appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to give them a separate day on which to discuss the financial Resolution. He thought it was a revolution in procedure to mix up the Committee Stage of the Bill with the Committee Stage of the financial Resolution. Hitherto there had not been any disposition or tendency towards obstruction on this Bill, and there was no necessity to make a new precedent. If there was any obstruction in Committee of Ways and Means in regard to the financial Resolution, it was always open to the right hon. Gentleman, who was a man of courage, to move the closure, which he had no doubt would under such circumstances be granted. When the right hon. Gentleman was going to revolutionise the whole scheme for the defence of the country, he ought to give the House an opportunity of dealing with the financial proposals, and himself an opportunity of showing that they would be successful.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN (Worcestershire, E.) said he had hung back from taking part in the discussion because he had hoped that they were going to have some further utterance from the Treasury Bench. He thought the Amendment of his hon. friend was worthy of more consideration by the Government than they had yet given it, because it proceeded upon their own principle, and was in harmony with their own declarations. What was it that his right hon. friend proposed? It was that, leaving intact all the rest of the closure procedure, the financial Resolution should be excluded from the Resolution. It was not part of the Prime Minister's original idea to send the financial clauses upstairs, and the fact that he foreshadowed as a part of the original proposal of sending the other parts upstairs, might be a reason for limiting the time on the discussion of those parts, but was no argument for limiting the discussion on the financial clauses. The right hon. Gentleman was on stronger ground when they considered, not only this Resolution, but his Amendment of the Rules of Procedure. In the latter case he drew a distinction between financial and other business, and insisted that the House ought to retain the full control that hitherto had existed over all financial business. But the financial Resolutions in this case were the very Resolutions on which he proposed to curtail the rights of discussion. Having succeeded a week or two ago in carrying through the House an abrogation of the rights of the House to discuss clauses in Committee, the Government now came down and attempted to abrogate the rights of the House to discuss the financial clauses of the first Bill introduced under the new procedure. Let the House remember that finance was the *crux* of this question. The greatest difficulty that all had to contend with was the financial difficulty, and if that were eliminated anybody who occupied the position of the right hon. Gentleman could provide an Army. Finance was the *crux* of the question, and yet they were to be limited in their discussion on the financial clauses. The finance of this Bill was serious. The right hon. Gentleman had issued many Papers to the House and had promised more. It was to be hoped those Papers would be more illuminating, and would afford a more solid basis for their proceedings. Hitherto, they had had only one estimate of the force of the right hon. Gentleman's measure, and that the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean, had torn to shreds and tatters, showing the House that the estimate upon which they were proceeding and which they thought was a true estimate was false, that they were living in a fool's paradise, and at an early date would be undeceived. It was not only that the estimate presented was untrustworthy, as the right hon. Gentleman would himself admit, but it did not represent what was in his mind at the present time. The right hon. Gentleman had already pledged himself to fresh expenditure, but in addition the right hon. Member for Derbyshire had raised a serious question about the control the House exercised through the Public Accounts Committee and Comptroller and Auditor-General over the money to be expended. The right hon. Gentleman might be prepared to suggest means which would meet the criticisms of his right hon. friend, but no one could deny the gravity and importance of the issue raised. But was the House to have no full opportunity of considering the new proposals? This Bill was a veritable chameleon and changed its colour every time it came before the House. If they looked at the intrinsic importance of the question, or to the general principles which the Government had laid down for the conduct of their financial business, or, again, if they looked to the justification urged by the Prime Minister for introducing the proposed form of closure by compartments at that stage of the Bill, everything pointed to the desirability—nay, to the necessity—of excepting the Financial Resolution, and no argument that had been used in support of the closure in general was germane to this particular proposal. He should certainly support his right hon. friend if he went to a division.

MR. HALDANE said he was not entitled to speak again, but as there had been a general invitation to him to do so perhaps he might be allowed to reply to what had been said. He was sure that under the arrangement which had been made there was opportunity for complete discussion of the financial Resolution. The Committee stage of the Resolution would be taken on the first day, and the real debate upon it would come on Report, and also on the first sub-clause of Clause 3, which repeated the same thing over again. Therefore, on the second day they had both the Resolution and the clause, and ample opportunity for discussion. As the Prime Minister had said, they meant to apply the ordinary method of army finance to the business of the associations as regarded all sorts of money matters. They proposed under a system of careful inspection to require the certificate of the general officer commanding in camp for the expenditure which Parliament was asked to defray. In that way they should preserve the advantages and improve the system of Parliamentary control which existed to-day in the volunteer force. They were driven to something of that kind, otherwise the Territorial Army would be thrown into red-tapeism and correspondence about every item. He hoped that he had shown that they did not desire to curtail discussion on finance nor upon other matters. He had undertaken to lay a Paper on the Table of the House explaining these matters. The right hon. Gentleman had uttered a heresy which he confessed shocked him more than any other heresy in connection with this subject. The right hon. Gentleman had said, "If you want an efficient Army you must spend money." They had heard that doctrine again and again in the history of the British Army, and it had led to colossal failure. The great armies of the world, the army of Germany and the army of Japan, for instance, had been organised on a basis of frugality, and it was that frugality and the necessity for frugality which had given efficiency to the army administration of those two countries.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he had never suggested that the mere spending of money would provide an efficient Army. He did not want to refer to the instances of Germany and Japan, where they had compulsory service, which made a great difference. What he had said was that there were many ways of providing an efficient Army if money were no object, but the special difficulty of our problem was to provide an efficient Army on the volunteer principle.

MR. HALDANE said he confessed that it was an enormous difficulty; but he feared that the right hon. Gentleman had been affected by the damning heresy in military matters that a lavish expenditure would secure an efficient Army. It was just the other way. He had asked German generals their experience on the point and they had told him that by carefully considering the expenditure and thinking out the organisation they got a really efficient Army and secured plenty of money for the things which were necessary. In regard to the fifteen day's camp the estimate was £170,000; but if his conjecture was right, and they stayed the fifteen days, the sum would be £130,000. That was one item. The other was the provision for the walking-out dress. At the present moment he estimated that at something like £300,000 more. He had pointed out that the auxiliary forces at present cost £4,500,000, and that the Territorial Army, on a basis pretty lavishly calculated, worked out at £2,850,000. He believed the working out of the whole thing would leave him a margin on which he would be able to work. He did not think that he had in this House the character of being extravagant, and he believed the estimate he had placed before the House might be relied upon to this extent—that they would keep very close to the figures which had been given. In framing his Estimates he felt sure the House, notwithstanding its mood for economy, would force him up, and he had provided himself with a margin for such a contingency. The increased camp allowance and the walking-out dress which he had undertaken to give would absorb a considerable sum. But he believed the actual figures would work out very close to, if not actually at, the Estimate he had prepared.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said the right hon. Gentleman's most interesting speech was really conclusive in favour of the Amendment, for he had proved beyond question how great was the importance of the financial clauses of the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had got off his speech upon his proposals; but it would be out of order to reply, and they were not going to have full opportunity of reply hereafter. He thanked the right hon. Gentleman for what he had just told them, for he could not have supplied them with a stronger argument for letting the House have its full liberty of debate when those clauses came on.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 286; Noes, 87. (Division List No. 158.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, John Emmott (Somerset
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo.
Bennett, E. N.
Berridge, T. H. D
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Rom'frd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Birrell, Rt. Hon. Augustine
Black, Arthur W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Bright, J. A.
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T (Cheshire
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.

Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton,Rt.Hn.SydneyCharles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton,Rt.Hn.RichardKnight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clarke, C. Goddard (Peckham)
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett,CH(Sussex,E.Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Davies,David(MontgomeryCo.
Davies, M.Vaughan-(Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh,S.)
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C.(Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne,MajorE.Martin(Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes,Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner,Col.Alan(Hereford,S.
Gladstone,Rt.Hn.HerbertJohn
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Grant, Corrie
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon.Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson,J.M.(Aberdeen,W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope,W.Bateman(Somerset,N.
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones,SirD.Brynmor(Swansea
Jones,William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea,HughCecil (St.Pancras, E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex,Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lough, Thomas
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(FalkirkB'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon(Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Money, L. G. Chiozza
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Morley, Rt. Hon. John
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholson, Chas. N. (Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W. D. (Colchester)
Philipps, Col.Ivor(S'thampton)
Philipps, J.Wynford(Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh,Central)
Price, Robt. John (Norfolk, E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B.(Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards, Thos. (W. Monm'th)
Richards, T.F. (Wolverh'mpt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, G. H. (Norwich)
Robertson, Rt. Hn. E.(Dundee
Robertson,SirG.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne)
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn. A. Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Stewart-Smith, D. (Kendal)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant, Sir Edward(Salisbury
Thomas, Abel(Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan,E.)
Thomas,DavidAlfred(Merthyr)
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somers-
Tomkinson, James
Torrance, Sir A. M.
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John(Stoke upon Trent)

Ward, W.Dudley Southampton
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher, Rt. Hn. Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (City Lond.
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach, Hn. Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bignold, Sir Arthur
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bowles, G. Stewart
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Bull, Sir William James
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt. Hn. Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Worc
Channing, Sir Francis Allston
Cheetham, John Frederick
Clark, George Smith (Belfast, N.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig Chas. Curtis (Antrim, S.)
Craig, Capt. James (Down, E.)
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, J.
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Hervey, F. W. F. Bury, S. Edm'ds
Hill, Sir Clement (Shrewsbury)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hon. Col. W
Keswick, William
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lane-Fox, G. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Col.-Lt. A. R.
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Dublin, S.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Roberts, S. (Sheffield, Ecclesall)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staffs'h.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thornton, Percy M.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

MR. WYNDHAM moved an Amendment which he said he would explain without reading. Assuming that the Government allocated two days to clauses from 1 to 4, inclusive of the financial Resolution, he asked that they should allow for the rest of the Bill one more day, that was five days altogether, and that during those five days they should give the House something approaching more nearly to freedom of discussion. Was it unreasonable to ask for one more day? The reply might be made that the principal points were in the first clauses of the Bill, and that the remaining clauses were not nearly of like importance. He ventured to say that in the judgment of the Leader of the Opposition, and those who acted with him, there were matters in the last thirty-four clauses of the Bill as important as, and perhaps more important than, the matter contained in the first four clauses of the Bill. Complete freedom of discussion they could not get under this Resolution even if it were passed in the amended form which he advocated. He urged that the critics of the Bill, friendly as well as hostile, should be the judges of what were the important clauses among the thirty-four remaining in the Bill. He thought that was a reasonable plea. The right hon. Gentleman was trying to minimise the importance of the Bill by saying that these clauses were only enabling clauses. They were enabling clauses for which there was no precedent at all, and which were dangerous when they were dealing with the future defences of the country. If they looked at the subject-matter of that part of the Bill, they would find that three questions of immense interest were involved—the organisation, the training, and the obligation to serve in the

Auxiliary Forces. The Government under those thirty-four clauses took to themselves enabling powers so full that they could organise the Auxiliary Forces out of existence or as an amalgamated body, or as a Territorial Army, or as a special reserve. Critics, friendly as well as hostile, were entitled to choose the clauses which raised these important points. Full information should be given as to the organisation which the Government have decided ultimately to adopt. The Government said that the Territorial Force was to be trained for fifteen days, but in a subsequent section power was taken to train that force for thirty days, and in another for eight days, or no days at all. On that matter the Bill gave the Government the widest possible latitude. Again, the really adequate training was only to be given after war had broken out, and not before. Further, under the Bill they gave themselves the enabling power to accept these forces for foreign service. Therefore the House was entitled to say that they should have full opportunities for discussion of Clauses 6 and 32 which dealt with organisation; of Clauses 11 and 12, which dealt with obligation to serve; and of Clauses 14 to 16, which dealt with training. His plea was that five days should be given to discuss these thirty-four clauses, which would make an average of seven clauses per day.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 10, to leave out from the word 'That,' to the word 'allotted,' in line 20, and insert the words 'the remaining Clauses of the Bill and the Schedules, and any new Government Clauses and any new Government Schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with and brought to a conclusion on the seventh.'"—(*Mr. Wyndham.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Resolution."

MR. HALDANE said that the unhappy person who had to reply so frequently was in a very difficult position. The House had just finished a series of criticisms upon the importance of giving prominence to the financial aspect of the Bill and that more time should be given to it. Now the questions of importance were said to be organisation, training, and obligation to serve; and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dover proposed that the whole of the later stages of the Bill should be taken up with the discussion of these subjects. The fact was that while there was agreement as to Clause 1 being the most important part of the Bill—[OPPOSITION cries of "No."]—in the early parts of the discussion every Member of the Opposition agreed in differing as to the other subjects of importance to be selected for debate; there was no common basis of agreement. The scheme for the allotment of time had been carefully thought out, although nothing was perfect in this imperfect world. He repeated again that the Bill was a measure to give effect to plans which were set out at great length on the introduction of the Estimates, on the First Reading of the Bill, and were subject to a three days' discussion on Second Reading. What they had now to discuss in Committee was simply the instruments which were necessary to carry out those plans. It was too late to discuss the principle of the Bill in Committee. The real time to discuss the principle of the Bill was not in Committee, but on the First and Second Reading. For these reasons he was prepared to maintain that the allotment of time for the discussion of clauses in Committee was wise and most reasonable.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said they did not complain of the right hon. Gentleman being too brief. Nor did they complain of his being too prolix, but what they did find fault with was that the right hon. Gentleman gave the Opposition no opportunity of answering him by way of criticism after he had expounded his position. His noble friend the Member for Marylebone had pointed out that this was one more step, and a most noticeable and marked one, in the process of transferring to the Government the powers which had hitherto been vested in the House. That statement had been illustrated by what the right hon. Gentleman had just said. The Prime Minister, earlier in the evening, justified his right hon. friend by saying that the scheme had been carefully thought out by the Secretary of State and his advisers. He did not doubt it; but the House was entitled to think it out, and express an opinion upon it. The Secretary of State had said that not only had the scheme of Army reform been carefully thought out by him, but also the scheme for the allocation of the time to be devoted to its discussion. Then the right hon. Gentleman said to them, in effect, "What more do you want," and apparently thought he should be judge in his own cause, and the House of Commons were not expected to pronounce any opinion.

Question put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 293; Noes, 89. (Division List No. 159.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Astbury, John Meir
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.)
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A, Cecil
Bell, Richard
Bellairs, Carlyon
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S.Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J. H. (Essex, Romf'rd
Bethell, T. R. (Essex, Maldon)
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt Hn Sir J. T. (Chesh.
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W, J. D.
Burt, Rt. Hon. Thomas
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Rich'rd Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C. H (Sussex, E. Grinst'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.)
Duckworth, James
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn, Herbert John
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J. M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Herbert, T. Arnold (Wycombe)
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles, E. H.
Hodge, John
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.)
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Lewis
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.
Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B.
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald, J. M. (Falkirk B'ghs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeigh, Charles (Donegal, E.)
M'Crae, George
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks, G. Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Morrell, Philip

Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncast'r
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal(Tipperary,Mid
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Grady, J.
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W.D. (Colchester)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pollard, Dr.
Price,C.E.(Edinburgh,Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk,E.)
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford, E.
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Rendall, Athelstan
Richards,Thomas (W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampton
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Bradf'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Runciman, Walter
Russell, T, W.
Samuel,Herbert L.(Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T. (Hawick B.)
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley,Hn.A.Lyulph (Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor,Theodore C.(Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward(Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen,E.)
Thomas,Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred (Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(Somerset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton,Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward,John (Stoke upon Trent)
Ward,W.Dudley (Southampt'n
Wardle, George J.
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason,John Cathcart (Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley,John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Wilson, J. W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St, Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

Tellers for the Ayes—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt.Hon.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish,Rt.Hn.Victor C. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hn.J.A(Worc.
Clark,George Smith (Belfast,N.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis (Antrim,S.
Craig,Capt. James (Down, E.)
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber, George Denison (York)
Faber, Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.)
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, J.
Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy,Laurence(Kent,Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey,F.W.F.(BuryS.Edm'ds
Houston, Robert Paterson
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney,Rt.Hn.Col. W.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Law, Andrew Bonar (Dulwich)
Lee,Arthur H.(Hants., Fareh'm
Lockwood,Rt.Hn.Lt.-Col. A.R.
Long,Col.Charles W.(Evesham)
Long, Rt.Hn.Walter (Dublin,S.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Marks, H. H. (Kent)
Mason, James F. (Windsor)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Nield, Herbert
Pease,Herbert Pike (Darlington
Rawlinson,John Frederick Peel
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Rutherford, John (Lancashire)
Rutherford, W. W. (Liverpool)
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield,Sir BerkeleyGeorge D.
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley,Hon.Arthur(Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill, Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson,W.Mitchell- (Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent,Col. Sir C. E. Howard

Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Amendment proposed—

"In line 60, at the end, to add the words, 'After the passing of this order on any day on which any proceedings on the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, including the financial Resolution relating thereto, stand as first order of the day, no opposed private business shall be taken.'"—(*Sir A. Acland-Hood.*)

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and agreed to.

Main Question, as amended, put.

The House divided:—Ayes, 333; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 160.)

AYES.

Acland, Francis Dyke
Agnew, George William
Ainsworth, John Stirling
Alden, Percy
Allen, A. Acland (Christchurch)
Ambrose, Robert
Armitage, R.
Armstrong, W. C. Heaton
Astbury, John Meir
Atherley-Jones, L.
Baker, Sir John (Portsmouth)
Baker, Joseph A. (Finsbury, E.)
Balfour, Robert (Lanark)
Baring, Godfrey (Isle of Wight)
Barlow, Percy (Bedford)
Barnard, E. B.
Barnes, G. N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Barry, Redmond J. (Tyrone, N.
Beale, W. P.
Beauchamp, E.
Beck, A. Cecil
Benn, W. (T'w'r Hamlets, S. Geo
Berridge, T. H. D.
Bertram, Julius
Bethell, Sir J.H. (Essex, Romf'd
Billson, Alfred
Black, Arthur W.
Boland, John
Bowerman, C. W.
Brace, William
Bramsdon, T. A.
Brigg, John
Brocklehurst, W. B.
Brooke, Stopford
Brunner, J. F. L. (Lancs., Leigh)
Brunner, Rt. Hn. Sir J.T. (Ches.
Bryce, J. Annan
Burns, Rt. Hon. John
Burnyeat, W. J. D.
Buxton, Rt. Hn. Sydney Charles
Byles, William Pollard
Cairns, Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Carr-Gomm, H. W.
Causton, Rt. Hn. Richard Knight
Cawley, Sir Frederick
Chance, Frederick William
Cheetham, John Frederick
Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Clancy, John Joseph
Cleland, J. W.
Clough, William
Clynes, J. R.
Cobbold, Felix Thornley
Cogan, Denis J.
Collins, Stephen (Lambeth)
Collins, Sir Wm. J. (S. Pancras, W
Cooper, G. J.
Corbett, C.H. (Sussex, E. Gr'st'd
Cornwall, Sir Edwin A.
Cory, Clifford John
Cotton, Sir H. J. S.
Cowan, W. H.
Crean, Eugene
Cremer, William Randal
Crooks, William
Crosfield, A. H.
Crossley, William J.
Dalmeny, Lord
Davies, David (Montgomery Co.
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Davies, Timothy (Fulham)
Delany, William
Devlin, Joseph
Dewar, Arthur (Edinburgh, S.
Dillon, John
Dolan, Charles Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Duckworth, James
Duffy, William J.
Duncan, C. (Barrow-in-Furness
Dunn, A. Edward (Camborne)
Dunne, Major E. Martin (Walsall
Elibank, Master of
Erskine, David C.
Essex, R. W.
Esslemont, George Birnie
Evans, Samuel T.
Eve, Harry Trelawney
Everett, R. Lacey
Fenwick, Charles
Ferens, T. R.
Ffrench, Peter
Field, William
Fiennes, Hon. Eustace
Findlay, Alexander
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Fuller, John Michael F.
Fullerton, Hugh
Gardner, Col. Alan (Hereford, S.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Glover, Thomas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Gooch, George Peabody
Greenwood, G. (Peterborough)
Greenwood, Hamar (York)
Gulland, John W.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Gwynn, Stephen Lucius
Haldane, Rt. Hon. Richard B.
Halpin, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Lewis
Harmsworth, Cecil B. (Worc'r)
Hart-Davies, T.
Harvey, A. G. C. (Rochdale)
Harwood, George
Haslam, Lewis (Monmouth)
Haworth, Arthur A.
Hayden, John Patrick
Hazel, Dr. A. E.
Hazleton, Richard
Hedges, A. Paget
Hemmerde, Edward George
Henderson, Arthur (Durham)
Henderson, J.M. (Aberdeen, W.)
Henry, Charles S.
Higham, John Sharp
Hobart, Sir Robert
Hobhouse, Charles E. H.
Hodge, John
Hogan, Michael
Holland, Sir William Henry
Hooper, A. G.
Hope, W. Bateman (Somerset, N.
Horniman, Emslie John
Hudson, Walter
Hutton, Alfred Eddison
Hyde, Clarendon
Illingworth, Percy H.
Isaacs, Rufus Daniel
Jardine, Sir J.
Jenkins, J.
Johnson, W. (Nuneaton)
Jones, Sir D. Brynmor (Swansea
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Jowett, F. W.
Joyce, Michael
Kearley, Hudson E.
Kekewich, Sir George
Kettle, Thomas Michael
Kincaid-Smith, Captain
King, Alfred John (Knutsford)
Kitson, Rt. Hon. Sir James
Laidlaw, Robert
Lamb, Edmund G. (Leominster
Lamb, Ernest H. (Rochester)
Lambert, George
Lamont, Norman
Law, Hugh A. (Donegal, W.)
Lea, Hugh Cecil (St. Pancras, E.
Lehmann, R. C.
Lever, A. Levy (Essex, Harwich)
Lever, W. H. (Cheshire, Wirral)
Levy, Maurice
Lewis, John Herbert
Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. David
Lough, Thomas
Lundon, W.

Lupton, Arnold
Lyell, Charles Henry
Lynch, H. B,
Macdonald, J. R. (Leicester)
Macdonald,J.M.(Falkirk Bg'hs)
Mackarness, Frederic C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Macpherson, J. T.
MacVeagh,Charles (Donegal,E.
M'Crae, George
M'Kean, John
M'Kenna, Rt. Hon. Reginald
M'Killop, W.
M'Laren, H. D. (Stafford, W.)
M'Micking, Major G.
Maddison, Frederick
Mallet, Charles E.
Manfield, Harry (Northants)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Marks,G.Croydon (Launceston)
Marnham, F. J.
Massie, J.
Masterman, C. F. G.
Meagher, Michael
Menzies, Walter
Micklem, Nathaniel
Molteno, Percy Alport
Mond, A.
Mooney, J. J.
Morgan, G. Hay (Cornwall)
Morrell, Philip
Morton, Alpheus Cleophas
Napier, T. B.
Newnes, F. (Notts, Bassetlaw)
Newnes, Sir George (Swansea)
Nicholson,Charles N.(Doncas'r)
Nolan, Joseph
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Nugent, Sir Walter Richard
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Nuttall, Harry
O'Brien,Kendal (TipperaryMid
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Doherty, Philip
O'Donnell, C. J. (Walworth)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
O'Grady, J.
O'Hare, Patrick
O'Kelly,James (Roscommon,N
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
O'Shee, James John
Parker, James (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Pearce, Robert (Staffs. Leek)
Pearson, Sir W.D. (Colchester)
Pearson, W.H.M. (Suffolk, Eye)
Perks, Robert William
Philipps,Col.Ivor (S'thampton)
Philipps,J.Wynford (Pembroke
Philipps, Owen C. (Pembroke)
Pickersgill, Edward Hare
Pollard, Dr.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Price, C. E. (Edinb'gh, Central)
Price,Robert John (Norfolk, E.
Priestley, Arthur (Grantham)
Priestley,W.E.B. (Bradford,E.)
Radford, G. H.
Rainy, A. Rolland
Raphael, Herbert H.
Rea, Russell (Gloucester)
Rea, Walter Russell (Scarboro'
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Rendall, Athelstan
Renton, Major Leslie
Richards, Thomas(W.Monm'th
Richards,T.F.(Wolverhampt'n
Ridsdale, E. A.
Roberts, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Robertson,Sir G.Scott(Br'df'rd
Robertson, J. M. (Tyneside)
Robinson, S.
Robson, Sir William Snowdon
Roche, Augustine (Cork)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Rose, Charles Day
Rowlands, J.
Russell, T. W.
Samuel, Herbert L. (Cleveland)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Scarisbrick, T. T. L.
Scott,A.H.(Ashton under Lyne
Sears, J. E.
Seaverns, J. H.
Seddon, J.
Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.(Hawick, B.)
Sheehy, David
Sherwell, Arthur James
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Silcock, Thomas Ball
Simon, John Allsebrook
Sinclair, Rt. Hon. John
Smeaton, Donald Mackenzie
Smyth, Thomas F. (Leitrim, S.)
Spicer, Sir Albert
Stanger, H. Y.
Stanley, Hn. A.Lyulph(Chesh.)
Stewart, Halley (Greenock)
Strachey, Sir Edward
Straus, B. S. (Mile End)
Summerbell, T.
Taylor, Austin (East Toxteth)
Taylor, Theodore C. (Radcliffe)
Tennant,Sir Edward (Salisbury
Tennant, H. J. (Berwickshire)
Thomas,Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Thomas, Sir A.(Glamorgan, E.)
Thomas,David Alfred(Merthyr
Thomasson, Franklin
Thompson,J.W.H.(S'merset,E.
Tomkinson, James
Toulmin, George
Ure, Alexander
Verney, F. W.
Vivian, Henry
Waldron, Laurence Ambrose
Walker, H. De R. (Leicester)
Walters, John Tudor
Walton, Sir John L. (Leeds, S.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Ward, John (Stoke upon Trent)
Waring, Walter
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney)
Waterlow, D. S.
Watt, Henry A.
Wedgwood, Josiah C.
Weir, James Galloway
Whitbread, Howard
White, George (Norfolk)
White, J. D. (Dumbartonshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Whitehead, Rowland
Whitley, John Henry (Halifax)
Whittaker, Sir Thomas Palmer
Wiles, Thomas
Wilkie, Alexander
Williams, J. (Glamorgan)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Wills, Arthur Walters
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Wilson, J.W.(Worcestersh. N.)
Wilson, P. W. (St. Pancras, S.)
Wilson, W. T. (Westhoughton)
Winfrey, R.
Wood, T. M'Kinnon
Young, Samuel

TELLERS FOR THE AYES—Mr. Whiteley and Mr. J. A. Pease.

NOES.

Anson, Sir William Reynell
Anstruther-Gray, Major
Ashley, W. W.
Aubrey-Fletcher,Rt. Hn.Sir H.
Balcarres, Lord
Banbury, Sir Frederick George
Banner, John S. Harmood-
Barrie, H. T. (Londonderry, N.
Beach,Hn.Michael Hugh Hicks
Beckett, Hon. Gervase
Bowles, G. Stewart
Boyle, Sir Edward
Bridgeman, W. Clive
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Butcher, Samuel Henry
Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.
Carlile, E. Hildred
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Castlereagh, Viscount
Cavendish, Rt.Hn. Victor C.W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cecil, Lord John P. Joicey-
Cecil, Lord R. (Marylebone, E.)
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.A.(Wor.
Clark,George Smith(Belfast,N.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Courthope, G. Loyd
Craig,Charles Curtis(Antrim,S.
Craig,Captain James(Down, E.
Craik, Sir Henry
Dalrymple, Viscount
Doughty, Sir George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Faber,Capt. W. V. (Hants, W.
Fell, Arthur
Finch, Rt. Hon. George H.
Forster, Henry William
Gordon, J.

Haddock, George R.
Hamilton, Marquess of
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Harrison-Broadley, H. B.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Helmsley, Viscount
Hervey, F. W. F. (Bury S. Edm's)
Hunt, Rowland
Kenyon-Slaney, Rt. Hn. Col. W.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham
Lockwood, Rt. Hn. Lt.-Col. A. R.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Dublin, S
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. Alfred
M'Calmont, Colonel James
Moore, William
Morpeth, Viscount
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Rawlinson, John Frederick Peel
Salter, Arthur Clavell
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sheffield, Sir Berkeley George D.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Starkey, John R.
Staveley-Hill Henry (Staff'sh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Thomson, W. Mitchell-(Lanark)
Thornton, Percy M.
Turnour, Viscount
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. Howard
Walrond, Hon. Lionel
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Younger, George

TELLERS FOR THE NOES—Sir Alexander Acland-Hood and Viscount Valentia.

Ordered, That the Committee stage and Report stage of the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, including the financial Resolution relating thereto, shall be proceeded with in the following manner:—(*a*) That Clauses 1 and 2 and the Committee stage of the financial Resolution be proceeded with and proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the first allotted day; (*b*) That the Report stage of the financial Resolution and Clauses 3 and 4 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the second allotted day; (*c*) That Clauses 5 to 7 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the third allotted day; (*d*) That Clauses 8 to 12 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the fourth allotted day; (*e*) That Clauses 13 to 27 be proceeded with and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on the fifth allotted day; (*f*) That the remaining clauses of the Bill and the schedules, and any new Government clauses and any new Government schedules, and any other matters necessary to bring the Committee stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with and brought to a conclusion on the sixth allotted day, and that the Chairman report the Bill to the House without Question put; (*g*) That two allotted days be given to the Report stage of the Bill, and that new clauses and Clauses 1 to 15 of the Bill be proceeded with on the first of those allotted days and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day, and that the remaining clauses of the Bill and the schedules, and any other matter necessary to bring the Report stage to a conclusion, be proceeded with on the second of those allotted days and the proceedings thereon brought to a conclusion on that day.

After this Order comes into operation, any day (other than a Friday) shall be considered an allotted day for the purposes of this Order on which the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill is put down as the first Order of the Day, or on which any stage of the financial Resolution relating thereto is put down as the first Order of the Day, followed by the Bill.

At 10.30 p.m. on any allotted day on which proceedings on any business allotted to that day are to be brought to a conclusion, the Chairman or Speaker shall, if those proceedings have not already been brought to a conclusion, put forthwith the Question or Questions on any Amendment or Motion already proposed from the Chair, and shall next proceed successively to put forthwith the Question on any Amendments moved by the Government of which notice has been given, but no other Amendments, and on any Question necessary to dispose of the business to be concluded, and in the case of Government Amendments or of Government new clauses or schedules he shall put only the Question that the Amendment be made or that the clause or schedule be added to the Bill, as the case may be.

At 11 p.m. on the day on which the Third Reading of the Bill is put down as first Order of the Day, or if that day is a Friday at 5 p.m., the Speaker shall put forthwith any Question necessary to complete the proceedings on that stage of the Bill.

Proceedings to which this Order relates shall not, on any allotted day on which proceedings or any business are to be brought to a conclusion under this Order, be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House.

After the passing of this Order, on any day on which any proceedings on the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill (including the financial Resolution relating thereto) stand as first Order of the Day, no dilatory Motion on the Bill, nor Motion for Adjournment under Standing Order 10, nor Motion to postpone a clause shall be received unless moved by a Minister of the Crown, and the Question on any such Motion shall be put forthwith without debate.

After the passing of this Order on any day on which any proceedings on the Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, including the financial Resolution relating thereto, stand as first Order of the Day, no opposed Private Business shall be taken.—(*Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*)

Adjourned at twenty-eight minutes after Eleven o'clock.

[APPENDICES.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME CLXXIII.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column refer to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following title indicates that the Bill originated in the House of Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
*Companies [H.L.]	*Earl of Granard*	Committee 2nd May (9961)
Dental Companies (Restriction of Practice) [H.L.]	*Lord Hylton*	Read 2^a 29th April (470)
*Destructive Insects Pest [H.L.]	*Earl Carrington*	Read 2^a 29th April (471) Committee 30th April (631)
*Employment of Women [H.L.]	*Earl Beauchamp*	Read 1^a 6th May (1298)
*Factory Workshop [H.L.]	*Earl Beauchamp*	Read 1^a 2nd May (905)
House of Lord Reform [H.L.]	*Lord Newton*	Second Reading (adjourned) 6th May (1203)
Irish Tobacco		Read 1^a 30th April (631)
Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment [H.L.]	*Lord Ampthill*	Read 1^a 29th April (464)
Municipal Reform [H.L.]	*Lord Courtney of Penwith*	Read 2^a 30th April (631)
Prohibition of Medical Practice by Companies [H.L.]	*Lord Hylton*	Read 2^a 29th April (464)
*Rule Committee [H.L.]	*Lord Chancellor*	Committee Report } 24th April (3) Read 3^a and passed 25th April (227)
Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries [H.L.]	*Earl Carrington*	Second Reading (adjourned) 29th April (472)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.	Brought in by	Progress.
Compulsory Weighing and Measurements	*Mr. G. Roberts*	Read 2° 3rd May (1171)
Incest	*Col. Lockwood*	Read 1° 30th April (991)
Intestate Husband's Estates (Scotland)	*Mr. Crombie*	Read 2° 3rd May (1185)
Irish Tobacco	*Mr. W. Redmond*	Report 24th April (176)
Jurors (Expenses)	*Mr. Lloyd Morgan*	Second Reading (adjourned) 3rd May (1199)
Limited Partnerships	*Mr. W. Holland*	Read 2° 3rd May (1119)
Local Authorities (Taxation and Purchase of Land)	*Mr. Thomasson*	Read 1° 2nd May (1087)
Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland)	*Mr. R. Balfour*	Read 2° 26th April (386)
Mortgage of Premises	*Mr. J. Walton*	Read 1° 24th April (72)
Municipal Elections	*Mr. Cleland*	Read 1° 25th April (294)
*Naval Lands (Volunteers)	*Mr. E. Robertson*	Read 1° 25th April (294)
Small Holding (No. 3)	*Mr. G. Hardy*	Bill withdrawn 6th May (1364)
*Small Landholders (Scotland)	*Mr. Sinclair*	Second Reading 29th April (547) (615) Second Reading 30th April (715)
*Vaccination	*Mr. J. Burns*	Read 1° 30th April (715)

APPENDIX II.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, SESSION 1907.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

In Continuation of List given in previous Volume.

Title of Paper.	Date from which the Period runs.	Period to lie upon the Table.
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copy of Order made by the Council of the County Borough of Swansea, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the County Borough [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)]	24 April	40 days
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copy of Order made by the Urban District Council of Acton, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within the District [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)]	29 April	40 days
Shop Hours Act, 1904,—Copy of Order made by the Council of the City of Manchester, and confirmed by the Secretary of State for the Home Department, fixing the Hours of Closing for certain classes of Shops within a certain part of the City [4 Edw. VII., c. 31, s. 3 (3)]	2 May	40 days

INDEX

TO THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

FIFTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1907.

APRIL 24—*MAY* 6.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time = 1R., 2R., 3R. [*c.*] = Commons. [*l.*] = Lords. *Amendt.* = Amendment. *Os.* = Observations. *Qs.* = Questions. *As.* = Answers. *Com.* = Committee. *Con.* = Consideration. *Rep.* = Report.

Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that stage of the Bill, or on that Vote.

Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

Aberdeenshire

Estates of Mr. Heaven and Mr. Coats, Cause for Extension of Sporting Ground on.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 6,* 1352.

Abraham, Mr. W. [Glamorgan, Rhondda]

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Procedure with and Proposals as to, *Apr. 25,* 272, 273.

Acland-Hood, Rt. Hon. Sir A. [Somerset, Wellington]

Limited Partnerships Bill, 2R., *May 3,* 1198.

Admiralty

First Lord—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
Financial Secretary—Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.

Contracts, Conditions of—Specifications as to British Materials.
Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 6,* 1324, 1325.

Messengerships, Appointments to, 1906–7.
Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 30,* 676.

Advertisements Regulation Bill

c. Rep. May 6,* 1363.

Africa, Central

Native Labour Recruitment, Embargo on.
Qs. Mr. Rees, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 1,* 865.

Africa, East

See also names of places.

Game Preservation, Measures taken for.
Q. Sir C. Hill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 1,* 1039.

Grogan Case

Charge against Captain Grogan—Award of Compensation to Natives, etc.
Qs. Mr. Smeaton, Mr. J. Ward, Mr. Lea; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 6,* 1333, 1334.

Date of summoning Captain Grogan, Authority for issue of Summonses, etc.
Qs. Mr. Carlile; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 29,* 527, 528.

Identity of and Offices held by Captain Grogan.
Q. Mr. Smeaton; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 6,* 1333.

[*cont.*

Africa, East—*cont.*
Grogan Case—*cont.*
Papers, Date of Tabling.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 1,* 866.
Kilindini Harbour Facilities, Proposals for improving.
Q. Sir C. Hill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 2,* 1039.

Africa, South
See also names of Colonies, etc.
Constabulary, Strength of and Purpose of Maintenance.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29,* 520, 521.
Garrison
Purpose of maintaining—Statement of Sir P. Fitzpatrick.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29,* 521, 522.
Strength and Cost of—Number of Home Troops maintained for supplying, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29,* 521.

Agriculture
Area under Cultivation in certain Foreign Countries.
Qs. Mr. Dolan; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 25,* 247, 248; *Apr. 29,* 504.
Classes and Schools assisted by Board of Education.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 25,* 274.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 25,* 279.
Grant, Increase of, proposed.
Q. Mr. C. B. Harmsworth; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 6,* 1311.
Instruction
Co-ordination of Work of Boards of Education and Agriculture, proposals for.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 25,* 288, 289.
Terms of Reference of Inquiry into.
Qs. Mr. Ashley; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 25,* 278.

Agriculture and Fisheries, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.
Salaries of Staff, Decision as to and Date of Last Revision.
Q. Viscount Helmsley; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 29,* 537.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland
Grants, Endowment, etc., Information as to.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 61.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, Ireland—*cont.*
Salaries—Postponement of Applications for increase proposed.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 2,* 1073.
Schemes, Local Contributions to—Return ordered, *Apr. 24,* 6.
Travelling Veterinary Inspector, Proposals for appointing.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1,* 855.
Vice-President
Inadvisability of making Change in present Tenure before Presenting of Report of Committee of Inquiry.
Os. Mr. Brooke, *Apr. 24,* 144–147; Sir F. Channing, 147–149; Mr. Butcher, 155, 158; Mr. Birrell, 163.
Office to be a Ministerial and Parliamentary one, and to be vacated on a change of Government, proposed.
Os. Mr. Murphy, *Apr. 24,* 136; Mr. Mooney, 140–144; Mr. Brooke, 146; Mr. Butcher, 155; Mr. J. Redmond, 159–161; Mr. Birrell, 164–166; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 167–169.
Plunkett, Sir H., Reason for Retention in Office—Local Opinion in Ireland, etc.
Os. Mr. Murphy, *Apr. 24,* 136–140; Mr. Mooney, 140–144; Mr. Dillon, 149–154; Mr. Butcher, 154–159; Mr. J. Redmond, 159–161; Mr. Birrell, 161–166; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 167–171; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 171, 172.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 29,* 546.
Qualifications required of.
Q. Mr. Moore; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 2,* 1081.
Working of
Date of Presenting Report of Inquiry.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 54.
Inspection by English Departmental Committee proposed.
Qs. Mr. Barrie, Capt. Donelan; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 30,* 705, 706.
Minutes of Evidence, Publication of, proposed.
Q. Mr. W. Long; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1,* 887.

Ainsworth, Mr. J. S. [Argyll]
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29,* 628.

Alden, Mr. P. [Middlesex, Tottenham]
  Poor Law—Married Applicants, Production of Marriage Certificates by, Practice in Kensington and Bethnal Green, *Apr. 24*, 26.
  Ramsgate—Rooms in use at St. George's and Ellington Schools, *Apr. 25*, 230.

Alderney
  Abattoir, Decision as to.
    Qs. Sir W. Bull; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 25*, 246.

Aliens
  Employment in East End, and consequent exclusion of English Labour.
    Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Apr. 29*, 534.
  Exclusion and Deportation of Undesirables, Necessity for—Presentment by Grand Jury of the Central Criminal Court.
    Qs. Mr. Ashley, Sir W. Evans-Gordon, Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 29*, 530, 531.
  Naturalisation Certificates granted in 1906, and proposals for reducing Fees.
    Q. Mr. Cave; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 24*, 27.

Aliens Act
  Report and Statement (1906), Presented, *May 6*, 1202, 1300.

Allen, Mr. A. A. [Christchurch]
  Post Office Overseers in London Service, Qualifications required of, *May 6*, 1350.

Allendale, Baron
  Introduced to House of Lords, *Apr. 25*, 177.

Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
  Poor Law Returns as to Pauperism in Ireland, Necessity for and Work Involved in Preparing, *Apr. 29*, 514.

Ampthill, Lord
  House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1254–1263.

Ancient Monuments, Ireland
  See under Ireland.

Anstruther-Gray, Major [St. Andrews Burghs]
  Army
    Auxiliary Forces, Proposals as to, under New Scheme, *Apr. 29*, 497, 522, 523.
    Bayonet, New, Pattern of, *May 6*, 1326.
    Cavalry
      Scotland, Proposals for Allocating to, *May 6*, 1326.
      Sword, Decision as to, *May 6*, 1325.

Anstruther-Gray, Major—*cont.*
  Army—*cont.*
    Second Line—Separation Allowance for Lance-Corporals, *May 6*, 1327.
  Coastguard Stations, Supply of Cliff Ladders to, *Apr. 29*, 535.
  "Mikado"—Prohibition of Performance by Naval and Marine Bands, *May 6*, 1324.
  Militia Training—Reason for Abandonment of Shooting Instruction for Garrison Artillery, *Apr. 29*, 523.
  Navy—Rosyth, Policy as to, *Apr. 25*, 331, 332; *May 2*, 1053.
  Nicaragua—Salado, Circumstances of cutting down of British Flag, *May 2*, 1059.
  Post Office Sick Leave and Pay Regulations, *May 2*, 1067.
  Punjab—Information as to Rawalpindi Disturbances, *May 6*, 1331.
  St. Lucia Riots, information as to and measures taken to restore order *May 2*, 1055.
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 786–788.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Reorganisation under, Proposals for carrying out, *May 6*, 1329.
  Turkey
    Attack on Mr. Heathcote Smith by Albanians at Uskub, *May 6*, 1345.
    Circumstances of Capture of Mr. Abbott by Brigands, *May 2*, 1061.
  Volunteer Gunner Crossan, Compensation Claim of, *Apr. 29*, 522.
  Woolwich Arsenal Discharges—Number projected, *Apr. 29*, 526.

Antrim
  Income Tax Appeals, Place of Hearing in the the North.
    Q. Mr. Glendinning; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 24*, 64.

Appeals
  Standing Orders relating to, Alteration of Motion [Lord Loreburn], *May 6*, 1295–1298.

Argentina
  Commercial Travellers, Tax on—Effect on British Trade.
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Apr. 29*, 535.

Arklow Harbour
  Report and Accounts (1906) Presented, *May 3*, 1166; *May 6*, 1203.
  Works, Progress made with.
    Qs. Sir T. Esmonde, *May 2*, 1126; Mr. Runciman, 1128.

Arkwright, Mr. J. S. [Hereford]
  Ballinageeragh, Attack on Police at—Trial of accused Persons, *Apr. 25*, 235.
  Rathkeale District Council, Charges of Extravagance against, *May 6*, 1315.

Army

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.

Parliamentary Secretary—Earl of Portsmouth.

Financial Secretary—Mr. T. R. Buchanan.

Artillery

Cost under present System and under new Scheme.
Q. Mr. A. Lee; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 24,* 19.

Garrison, Strength of—Effect of check on Recruiting.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29,* 517.

Auxiliary Forces (*see also titles* Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry)

New Scheme, Proposals as to.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29,* 497, 522, 523.

Bayonet, new, Decision as to Pattern of.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6,* 1326.

Bulford Camp — Accommodation for Married Establishment of Scots Greys.
Q. Captain Faber; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 2,* 864.

Bullets, small bore, Result of Inquiry into,
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 24,* 17.

Cavalry

Cause for Increase of Military Offences among.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6,* 1306.

Scotland, Proposals for allocating to.
Q. Major Anstruther Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6,* 1326.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6,* 1329.

Sword, Decision as to.
Qs. Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6,* 1325.

Colonial Militia and Volunteers, Information as to, in Army List.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 24,* 17.

Courts Martial during 1905–6, Statistics as to.
Qs. Mr. Lea; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29,* 519, 520.

Engineer Services

Staff, Proposals for improving position of.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6,* 1328.

Surveyors' salaries—Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Cave; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 1,* 861,

Army—*cont.*

Expenditure, Increase in.
Qs. Mr. Verney; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6,* 1327.

Fleetwood Camp, Troops to be trained at.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 30,* 684, 685.

General Staff—Cost entailed by Resolution of Colonial Conference.
Q. Mr. A. S. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 30,* 685.

Hamilton Barracks, Seams of Coal under—Reason for not continuing operations in extracting.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29,* 525.

Lyddite Shells made for Ordnance Factories, Cause for Rejection of.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6,* 1330, 1331.

Marines, Royal, *see that Title.*

Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry, *see those Titles.*

Officers—Colonels, honorary Rank of, on Retirement—Reason for abolishing Rank of Major-General.
Q. Sir R. Hobart; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29,* 524.

Ordnance Factory Adult Employees earning less than 30s. per week.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 30,* 685.

Pensions, Period for Payment of and Proposals for Prevention of spending on Drink.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29,* 516, 517.

Pimlico Clothing Factory—Adult Male Employees earning less than 30s. per week.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 30,* 685.

Rifles

Conversion of, Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 24,* 18.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29,* 518.

Sub-target Rifle, Decision as to Adoption of.
Qs. Mr. Guy Baring; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 30,* 685.

Sandhurst Cadets, Cause for Delay in Gazetting.
Qs. Sir P. Magnus, Mr. A. Lee; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 1,* 864.

Scots Greys—Date of leaving Piershill and Maryhill Barracks.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6,* 1329.

Second Line, *see subheading* Territorial Forces.

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
- Soldiers
  - Education Certificates, Inducements to Obtain.
    - *Q.* Mr. Lea ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29*, 520.
  - Families, Rule Compelling Support of—Case of T. Sonden.
    - *Q.* Mr. Farrell ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 1*, 860.
  - Sentences of Penal Servitude in 1906, Particulars of Cases of.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Lea ; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29*, 494, 519.
- Strength—Statistics for 1905 and the Present Time.
  - *Q.* Mr. P. Pease ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29*, 517.
- Territorial Force or Second Line.
  - Age for Recruitment, etc.
    - *Os.* Earl of Wemyss, *Apr. 29*, 482 ; Earl of Portsmouth, 483.
  - Camp Pay and Allowance.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Ashley, Sir H. Vincent, Sir C. Dilke ; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 30*, 683, 684.
  - Camp Training, Period for and Cost of Allowance.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Ashley, Mr. Lee ; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6*, 1328, 1329.
  - Continental Troops, Possibility of Meeting—Amount of Drill required, etc.
    - *Os.* Earl of Wemyss, *Apr. 29*, 482, 483 ; Earl of Portsmouth, 483.
  - Drill, Minimum Annual Requirements.
    - *Os.* Earl of Wemyss, *Apr. 29*, 482 ; Earl of Portsmouth, 483, 486 ; Marquess of Salisbury, 485, 486.
  - Lance-Corporals, Separation Allowance for, when in Camp.
    - *Q.* Mr. Ashley ; Major Anstruther-Gray ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6*, 1326, 1327.
  - Messing and Camp Allowance, Person Authorised to Expend.
    - *Q.* Mr. Ashley ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6*, 1326.
  - Mobilisation, provisions for
    - *Qs.* Earl of Wemyss, *Apr. 29*, 482, 484 ; *A.* Earl of Portsmouth, 484.
  - Nomenclature proposed for.
    - *Q.* Sir C. Hill ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6*, 1328.
  - Regulations or Orders in Council—Submitting Specimen Draft to the House, proposed.
    - *Os.* Marquess of Salisbury, *Apr. 29*, 485.
  - Walking-out Uniform, provision of.
    - *Q.* Mr. Ashley ; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6*, 1326.

Army—*cont.*
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, *see that title.*
- Woolwich Arsenal, *see that title.*

Army (Annual) Bill
- *l.* Royal Assent, *Apr. 29*, 461.

Arnold-Forster, Rt. Hon. H. O. [Croydon]
- Rosyth, Policy as to, *Apr. 25*, 328, 329.

Ashbourne, Lord
- Companies Bill, *Com.*, *May 2*, 1006.
- Municipal Representation Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 652–654.
- Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 473.

Ashley, Mr. W. W. [Lancashire, N., Blackpool]
- Agriculture Instruction
  - Classes, etc., Assisted by Board of Education, *Apr. 25*, 274, 279
  - Co-ordination of Work of Boards of Education and Agriculture, proposals for, *Apr. 25*, 288.
  - Terms of Reference of Inquiry into, *Apr. 25*, 278.
- Aliens, Exclusion and Deportation of Undesirables, Necessity for—Presentment by Grand Jury of Central Criminal Court, *Apr. 29*, 530.
- Army
  - Cavalry Sword, Decision as to, *May 6*, 1325.
  - Second Line
    - Camp Pay and Allowance, *Apr. 30*, 683, 684 ; *May 6*, 1326.
    - Camp Training Period for and Cost of Allowance, *May 6*, 1328.
    - Lance-Corporals, Separation Allowance for, *May 6*, 1326, 1327.
    - Walking-out Uniform, Provision of, *May 6*, 1326.
- Coastguard stations closed—Disposal of Men, *Apr. 25*, 256.
- Dover Harbour Works, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 316.
- Egypt—Proposals for Abolition of Date Tax, *Apr. 30*, 695.
- Fleetwood Camp, Troops to be Trained, *Apr. 30*, 684.
- Gawran—Case of T. Gaffney, *Apr. 25*, 286.
- Navy
  - "Duke of Edinburgh," Circumstances of Grounding of, *Apr. 25*, 316.
  - Portsmouth Dockyard Lock, Proposals as to Construction of, *Apr. 25*, 316, 317.
  - Rosyth, Policy as to, *Apr. 25*, 316.
  - Turbine Machinery, Facilities for Repair of, at Foreign Naval Stations, *Apr. 25*, 341.

[*cont.*

Ashley, Mr. W. W.—*cont.*
- Post Office Savings Bank Annuities, Provisions as to Compounding for, *May 2,* 1037.
- Simon's Bay Naval Dockyard, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25,* 316.
- Tea Duty, Reduction of, to Fourpence per Pound, proposed, *May 1,* 915.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Allocation of Time to various Stages, Proposals as to, *May 6,* 1384.
- Turkey Customs Increase—Opportunity for Parliamentary Discussion, *Apr. 20,* 693.

Ashton, Mr. T. G. [Beds., Luton]
- National Debt—Information as to Unfunded Debt, *May 6,* 1319.

Asia Minor
- Mersina, British Consular Representation at. *Q.* Mr. Higham; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 2,* 1063.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*Chancellor of the Exchequer* [Fife, E.]
- Bank of England—Payment of Interest on Irish Government Deposits, proposed, *May 6,* 1319.
- Budget Resolutions, Opportunity for Discussion of, *May 1,* 955, 956.
- Colonial Conference 1907, Preference Resolutions—Figures given in Speech of Chancellor of the Exchequer and responsibility for Publication, *May 6,* 1359.
- Estate Duty
  - Deductions under Section 21 of Finance Act of 1896, *May 1,* 947, 948.
  - Valuations, Persons qualified to make, *May 2,* 1049.
- Hire Purchase Agreements, Stamp Duty on, *May 1,* 945, 946.
- Income Tax
  - Assessment
    - Forms for 1907, Reason for use of in London, *Apr. 29,* 491.
    - Trading Concerns with fluctuating Profits, Application of Average System to, *May 6,* 1304.
  - Companies, Limited, Liability of, *Apr. 25,* 270, 271.
  - Compulsory Returns, Estimated Effect of, on Receipts, *Apr. 25,* 232.
  - Ecclesiastical Incomes, Abatement Permitted to be claimed on, *May 1,* 859.
  - Married Persons, Separate Assessment of Incomes of, proposed, *Apr. 24,* 120.
  - Wasting Security, Income derived—Definition as Earned or Unearned, *Apr. 30,* 677.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H.—*cont.*
- Land Purchase Guaranteed Stocks.
  - Post Office Facilities for Purchase, etc., *Apr. 24,* 29.
  - Sinking Fund Applicable to Redemption of, *May 1,* 848.
- National Debt
  - Permanent Annual Charge for Reduction of Debt, *May 1,* 951, 952.
  - Unfunded Debt, Information as to, *May 6,* 1319.
- Old-age Pensions
  - Calculations as to Number of Persons benefiting under Scheme starting on £2,250,000, *Apr. 25,* 269.
  - Intoxicants, Supplying to Pensioners—Proposals as to Penalty, *Apr. 25,* 269.
  - Poor Relief and Friendly Societies, Effect of Colonial and German Schemes on, *Apr. 25,* 270.
- Public Accounts Committee Report, Allowing Opportunity for Discussion of, *Apr. 24,* 96.
- Spirits
  - Basis of calculating Estimate of Cost to Distillers of Revenue Restrictions, *Apr. 29,* 508.
  - Plain, Imports during Last Twenty Years—Duty paid, etc., *Apr. 25,* 250.
- Sugar Duties, Desirability of remitting, *May 1,* 868.
- Taxation, Local—Assigned Revenue intercepted from the Treasury, Abolition of System, *Apr. 24,* 95.
- Tea Duty, Reduction of, to Fourpence per Pound, proposed, *May 1,* 906, 907.
- Tobacco Growing in Ireland, Government Assistance towards, *May 1,* 942.
- War Taxes, Reasons for continuing as a Permanent Charge, *May 1,* 933, 934, 938.

Atherley-Jones, Mr. L. [Durham, N.W.]
- Woolwich Arsenal Discharged Workmen, Proposals for Assisting, *Apr. 29,* 502.

Attorney-General
- *Sir J. Walton.*

Attorney-General for Ireland
- *Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.*

Australia
- (*See also names of States*).
- Commerce Act, Use of, to place British Imports at a Disadvantage, alleged. *Q.* Mr. Levy; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 24,* 32.

[*cont.*

Australia—*cont.*
  Military and Naval Defence, Expenditure on.
    Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 25*, 261.
  Naval Squadron, *see under Navy.*
  New Hebrides Convention, *see under* New Hebrides.

Auxiliary Forces
  See under Army, *also titles* Militia, Volunteers, Yeomanry.

Avebury, Lord
  Companies Bill, *Com.*, *May 2*, 996, 998, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1016, 1021.
  Municipal Representation Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 645–647.

Bagot Estate
  Sale Proposals for
    Q. Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 55.

Bailieborough
  Reinstatement Claim of Evicted Tenants.
    Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 513.
  Rural District Council Architect—Reason for Refusal of Sanction to Appointment of Mr. T. Daniel.
    Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 512, 513.

Baines' Name Bill
  l. 3R.* *Apr. 29*, 462.
  c. 1R.* *Apr. 30*, 662.
    2R.* *May 6*, 1299.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, Chorley]
  Africa, East—Date of Tabling Papers in Grogan Case, *May 1*, 866.
  Army Rifles, Proposals for Converting, *Apr. 29*, 518.
  Carnarvon Castle, Expenditure on, during Last Ten Years, *Apr. 26*, 382.
  Compulsory Weighing and Measurements Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1182–1184.
  Education Expenditure, Information as to, *Apr. 24*, 23.
  Halsall Charity—New Scheme, Date of Publication, *Apr. 24*, 39, 40.
  Income-Tax Assessment—Application of Average System to Trading Concerns with Fluctuating Profit, *May 6*, 1304.
  Intestate Husband's Estate (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1190.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Exemption of Financial Resolution from closure, proposed, *May 6*, 1441–1443.
  Transvaal Chinese Labour—Circumstances of Landing of Unlicensed Coolies, *May 2*, 1058.

Balfour, Capt. C. B. [Middlesex, Hornsey]
  Crouch End Telephone Exchange, Date of Opening, *May 2*, 1038.
  Income Tax — Ecclesiastical Incomes, Abatement permitted to be Claimed on, *May 1*, 859.

Balfour, Mr. R. [Lanarkshire, Partick]
  Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26*, 386, 394.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. [City of London]
  Bills—Resolutions dealing with Allocation of Time for Particular Bills, Expediency of, *May 6*, 1411.
  Business Committee, Establishment of, proposed, *May 6*, 1376, 1409.
  Business of the House, Course of, *Apr. 25*, 290; *Apr. 30*, 714; *May 2*, 1085.
  Curtailment of Debate and Interference with Liberties of the House, Objections to, *May 6*, 1374–1376.
  Irish Agriculture Department, Vice-President
    Office to be a Ministerial and Parliamentary one, and to be vacated on Change of Government, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 167–169.
    Plunkett, Sir H., Reasons for Retention in Office, *Apr. 24*, 167–171.
  Land Purchase, Financial Working of—Inquiry into or Opportunity for Discussion, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 67.
  Navy—Rosyth, Policy as to, *Apr. 25*, 326, 327.
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 717, 731, 746–762, 768, 770, 805, 806.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill
    Allocation of Time to Various Stages, Proposals as to, *May 6*, 1374–1380, 1408–1412.
    Artillery, Volunteer, Proposals as to, *May 6*, 1378.
    Financial Resolution, Exemption of from Closure, proposed, *May 6*, 1448.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord
  Companies Bill, *Com.*, *May 2*, 1008, 1009, 1010, 1012, 1013, 1015, 1020, 1023, 1024, 1031, 1032.
  House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1243–1248.
  Municipal Representation Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 647–651.
  Small Holdings
    Allotments and Small Holdings, Necessity for distinguishing in Papers, etc., relating to, *Apr. 25*, 213, 214.

[*cont.*

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord—*cont.*
Small Holdings—*cont.*
Circular issued by County Councils—Tabling answers received to, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 221.
Demand for—Substantiation of Allegations as to Attitude of Landowners, *Apr. 25*, 213, 214.

Ballaghaline
Fishing Pier, Necessity for Proceeding with. *Qs.* Mr. Halpin, Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30*, 710.

Ballina
Dispensary District—Conditions of Appointment of Dr. I. Clarke. *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 60.

Ballinageeragh
Attack on Police on 4th inst.—Procedure in Trial of Accused Persons. *Q.* Mr. Arkwright; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 235.

Ballingarry
Postmistress, Letters addressed to—Legality of refusing. *Q.* Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 30*, 713, 714.

Ballintubber
Payne, Mr., Hostile Demonstrations against. *Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Moore, Mr. Hayden; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 875, 876.

Ballymoney
Labourers' Cottage, Application of A. Thompson. *Q.* Mr. Glendinning; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 60.

Banbury, Sir F. G. [London, City of]
Cape Colony—Simon's Bay Naval Dockyard, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 312, 343.
Hire-Purchase Agreements, Stamp Duty on, *May 1*, 945.
Intestate Husband's Estate (Scotland) Bill, 2r., *May 3*, 1186–1188.
Limited Partnerships Bill, 2r., *May 3*, 1194, 1195.
National Debt—Permanent Annual Charge for Reduction of Debt, *May 1*, 949.
Navy
Dockyards, Policy with Regard to, Criticism of, *Apr. 25*, 343.
Portsmouth Dockyards
Lock, New, Proposals as to Construction of, *Apr. 25*, 311, 342.

Banbury, Sir F. G.—*cont.*
Portsmouth
Factory, Explanation of Vote for, *Apr. 25*, 335, 342.
Shop Hours Act, Failure of—Necessity for more Drastic Legislation with regard to closing of Shops and Hours of Shop Assistants, *May 1*, 974–978.
Shop Hours Bill, Attitude towards, *May 1*, 976, 977, 992.
Tea Duty—Reduction to 4d. per Pound, proposed, *May 1*, 910, 911.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Exemption of Financial Resolution from Closure, proposed, *May 6*, 1443.
Worthing Gas Bill, *Con.*, *Apr. 29*, 614–615.
War Taxes, Reasons for continuing as a Permanent Charge, *May 1*, 932.

Bank of England
Irish Government Deposits, Payment of Interest on, proposed. *Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 6*, 1319.

Bank of Ireland
Act constituting as Government Banker. *Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 6*, 1317, 1318.

Bankruptcy
Accounts (1906–7), Presented, *Apr. 26* 375; *Apr. 29*, 463.

Bankruptcy Laws
Inquiry—Date of Presenting Report and Proposals for Scottish Inquiry. *Q.* Mr. C. E. Price; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *May 6*, 1308.

Bann River
Drainage Scheme, Date of Proceeding with. *Os.* Mr. Moore, *May 2*, 1120–1122; Mr. Runciman, 1129; Mr. J. O'Connor, 1133, 1135.

Baring, Mr. G. O. [Winchester]
Army—Decision as to Adoption of Sub-Target Rifle, *Apr. 30*, 685.

Barlow, Mr. P. [Bedford]
Income-tax, liability of Police Pensions, *May 2*, 1069.

Barnard, Lord
Companies Bill, *Com.*, *May 2*, 1025, 1026, 1028.
Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 2r. *Apr. 29*. 475.

Barnard, Mr. E. B. [Kidderminster]
Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland), Bill, 2r., *Apr. 26*, 420.

Barnes, Mr. J. N. [Glasgow, Blackfriars]
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2r., *Apr. 29*. 585–590.

Barrie, Mr. H. T. [Londonderry, N.]
Administration of Ireland, Legislative proposals as to, *Apr. 25*, 289.
Agriculture Department, Work of—Inspection by English Departmental Committee, proposed, *Apr. 30*, 705, 706.
Fisheries, Irish—Amendment of Law proposed, *Apr. 29*, 511.
Irish Council Bill—Time Allotted to First Reading Debate, *May 6*, 1361.
Local Government Board
  Expenditure by, Increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1150, 1151.
  Inspectors
    Temporary, increase in Estimate for, *May 2*, 1151.
    Women Inspectors, Employment of Permanently, proposed, *May 2*, 1151.
  Tenders for Contracts, System of Surcharging Boards of Guardians, *May 2*, 1150.
Poor Law—Irish Reform, proposals, *Apr. 30*, 712.
Public Accounts in Ireland, Charges for Audit for, *May 2*, 1152.
Roman Catholic University, proposals as to, *Apr. 25*, 289.
Salmon Fisheries Advisory Committee, Constitution of, *Apr. 29*, 509.

Barrow River
Drainage Scheme, Date of Proceeding with. *Os.* Mr. Delany, *May 2*, 1116.

Barry, Mr. E. [Cork County, S.]
Muckross Barytes Mines, Report on, *May 6*, 1312.

Barry Estate
Sale proposals for and Price asked.
  Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 44, 45.
  Position of Cooldorihy Tenants.
    Q. Mr. Crean; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 882.

Basingstoke Gas Bill
l. 2r.* *Apr. 24*, 1.
  *Rep.** *Apr. 30*, 629.

Beach, Mr. M. Hicks [Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury]
Ceylon Coolie Children Facilities for Education of, *May 2*, 1059.
Coal Export Duty, Results of Abolition of, *Apr. 24*, 75.
Cocoa Duty, proposals as to, *Apr. 24*, 76.
Death Duties—Revision, proposals as to, *Apr. 24*, 74.
Defence of the Mediterranean—Names of Members of Committee, *May 2*, 1083.

Beach, Mr. M. Hicks—*cont.*
Income-tax
  Earned Incomes up to £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 73.
  Relation of Death Duties to Incidence of, *Apr. 24*, 72, 73.
India—Assam Coolie Children, Facilities for Education of, *May 2*, 1055.
Motors, Increase of Taxation on, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 76.
Rifle Clubs — Permitting Rook-shooting without taking out of Gun Licence, proposed, *May 2*, 1069.
Taxation, Local—Assigned Revenue Intercepted from the Treasury, Abolition of System, *Apr. 24*, 76.
Tea Duty
  Reduction to 4d. per Pound, proposed, *May 1*, 925.
  Remission, Reason for refusing, *Apr. 24*, 75.

Beale, Mr. W. P. [Ayrshire, S.]
Limited Partnerships Bill, 2r., *May 3*, 1197.

Beauchamp, Earl
Phosphorus Poisoning
  Moreland & Co., Messrs., Fatal Case at Factory of, *Apr. 25*, 185.
  Prohibition of Use of White and Yellow Phosphorus in Match Industry—Reconsideration of Attitude towards Convention of Berne, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 184, 185.

Beauly and Ness Rivers
Fishery Rights claimed in.
  Q. Mr. Weir; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 6*, 1351.

Beer
Excise Duties on, Continuance of, Resolution Reported, *May 1*, 903.
Ingredients used in.
  Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 2*, 1068.

Beith Academy
Status of.
  Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 24*, 42.

Belfast
Mills, Factories and Workshops
  Female Factory Inspector, Provision of, *Qs.* Mr. J. Devlin; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 25*, 287; *May 1*, 868.
  Number of Employees in,
    Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 25*, 286.

[*cont.*

Belfast—*cont.*
Parliamentary Election for North Belfast, Allegations as to Irregularities in.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 1*, 891.
Police Force—Promotion Claim of Sergeant Kerrigan.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 254, 255.
Wages of Operatives—Comparison with England.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Apr. 29*, 493.

Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]
Tramway Cars, Brakes for—Mode of Investigation into Matter, *Apr. 29*, 278.

Bellairs, Mr. C. [Lynn Regis]
Army—Lyddite Shells made at Ordnance Factories, Cause for Rejection of, *May 6*, 1330.
Malta Naval Works, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 320.
Navy
"Antrim," Result of Investigation into Erosion of Bottom Plates, *Apr. 29*, 498; *May 1*, 862.
Coaling Facilities—Organisation of Collier Service, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 318.
Docking Accommodation for large Vessels, *Apr. 25*, 338.
Dockyards
Policy with regard to, Criticism of, *Apr. 25*, 319-322.
Subsidising Private Dockyards proposed, *Apr. 25*, 320, 321.
"Duke of Edinburgh," Circumstances of grounding, *Apr. 25*, 320.
Mediterranean Fleet—Rank of Commander-in-Chief and Second-in-Command, *Apr. 25*, 257.
Portsmouth Dockyards, Lock, new, Proposals as to Construction of, *Apr. 25*, 318.
Rosyth
Policy as to, *Apr. 25*, 317, 322.
Price paid for and Date of Commencement of, Definite Proposals for utilising as Naval Base, *May 2*, 1053.
Shipbuilding—Increase in German programme, *Apr. 25*, 256.
Navy Estimates
Date of taking Vote 8, *May 2*, 1078.
Works—Transfer of Liabilities from Works Loans to the Vote, Policy of, *Apr. 25*, 317.
Osborne College Hospital, proposed Erection of, *Apr. 25*, 319.
Woolwich Arsenal, Allocation of Army and Navy Work to, in order to prevent Discharges, *May 6*, 1330.

Belloc, Mr. H. V. P. R. [Salford, S.]
Questions asked on Irish Matters—Imputation in Speech of Chief Secretary at Halifax, *May 1*, 897.

Benn, Sir J. W. [Devonport]
Naval Dockyards—Rate of Wages paid by Works Department, *May 2*, 1036.

Bermuda
Naval Dockyard Extension, Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 296.

Bethell, Mr. [Essex, Maldon]
Government Departments—Manufactured Articles obtained from abroad (1893–1906), *May 1*, 858.

Bexhill
War Office Land, Sale of
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 24*, 19.

Bills
Government Bills—Return as to Dates of Introduction and taking of Various Stages, Presented, *May 6*, 1203.
Resolutions Dealing with Allocation of Time for Particular Bills, Inexpediency of.
Os. Lord R. Cecil, *May 6*, 1396–1399; Mr. Mildmay, 1399; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1411.

Billson, Mr. A. [Staffordshire, N.W.]
Court of Criminal Appeal Bill—Date of taking Second Reading, *Apr. 29*, 545.

Bird Estate
Sale Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 286.

Birkenhead Corporation Water Bill
l. Report from the Committee of Selection, *May 2*, 994.

Birmingham Corporation Water Bill
l. 3R.* *May 1*, 821.
c. 1R.* *May 2*, 1034.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*Chief Secretary for Ireland* [Bristol, N.]
Administration
Boards engaged in—Return proposed, *May 3*, 1171.
Legislative Proposals as to, *Apr. 24*, 56.
Agriculture Department
Grants, Endowment, etc., Information as to, *Apr. 24*, 61.
Salaries—Postponement of Application for Increase, proposed, *May 2*, 1073.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

- Agriculture Department—*cont.*
  - Travelling Veterinary Inspector, Proposals for Appointing, *May 1*, 855.
  - Vice-President
    - Inadvisability of making Change in present Tenure before Presenting of Report of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 24*, 163.
    - Office to be a Ministerial and Parliamentary one and to be vacated on a Change of Government, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 164–166.
    - Plunkett, Sir H., Reasons for Detention in Office, *Apr. 24*, 161–166.
  - Working of, Inquiry into
    - Publication of Minutes of Evidence, proposed, *May 1*, 887.
    - Report, Date of Presenting, *Apr. 24*, 54.
- Bagot Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 24*, 55.
- Bailieborough
  - Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement Claims of, *Apr. 29*, 513.
  - Rural District Council Architect—Reason for Refusal of Sanction to Appointment of Mr. T. Daniel, *Apr. 29*, 513.
- Ballaghaline Fishing Pier, Necessity for proceeding with, *Apr. 30*, 710.
- Ballina Dispensary District—Conditions of Appointment of Dr. I. Clarke, *Apr. 24*, 60.
- Ballinageeragh, Attack on Police at—Trial of Accused Persons, *Apr. 25*, 235.
- Ballintubber — Hostile Demonstrations against Mr. Payne, *May 1*, 875, 876.
- Ballymoney—Labourers' Cottage Application of A. Thompson, *Apr. 24*, 60.
- Barry Estate, Sale Proposals for and Price asked, *Apr. 24*, 45.
  - Cooldorihy Tenants, Position of, *May 1*, 882.
- Belfast Police Force—Promotion Claim of Sergeant Kerrigan, *Apr. 25*, 255.
- Bird Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 25*, 286.
- Blacklion—Cause of Boycott of Mr. Taylor, *Apr. 24*, 45.
- Blennerhasset Estate, Sale Proposals for, and Rent Decrees Issued, *May 1*, 877, 878.
- Brosna—Cause for Outrage at Forde's House, *May 2*, 1076.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

- Browne Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 25*, 286.
- Caldbeck Estate—Cause for Delay in Sale Proposals, *May 6*, 1322.
- Calendar of Justiciary Rolls, Proposals for publishing, *Apr. 30*, 678.
- Carrick-on-Shannon Disturbance—Circumstance of Striking of Mr. Cooney by Constable, *May 1*, 888.
- Cattle, Irish, Allegations as to Fraudulent Sale of Inferior English Animals as—Measures proposed for Prevention, *Apr. 24*, 49.
- Cavan
  - Fitzpatrick, P., Reinstatement Claim of, *Apr. 26*, 385.
  - Urban Council Bylaws—Number submitted and Position in each Case, *May 6*, 1314.
- Charitable Donations and Bequests, Commissioners, Powers and Duties of, *Apr. 24*, 10, 44.
- Civil Service Estimates, Class 3, Vote 14, Sub-head F, Details of Expenditure under, *May 2*, 1050.
- Clare Evicted Tenants—Reinstatements Effected, *Apr. 30*, 709 ; *May 2*, 1072.
- Clifden Pier Works, Cause of Delay in Commencing, *May 2*, 1074.
- Clogher Courthouse—Reason for Refusal of use for Concert, *Apr. 29*, 494.
- Clooney, United Irish League Meeting, Reason for prohibiting, *May 1*, 853.
- Cloveneden Hibernian Band, Police Instructions as to Route to be taken by, *Apr. 29*, 491.
- Colmanstown—Outrage at House of Mr. Smith, *May 1*, 880.
- Condition of Ireland—Statement in Appeal by Lord Ashtown, *May 2*, 1077.
- Constabulary
  - Cruise, District Inspector, Allegations as to Complaints against, *Apr. 30*, 677.
  - Inspectors and Head Constables, Number and Religion of, *May 3*, 1170.
- Cooscroum Boat Slip, Decision as to, *Apr. 24*, 57.
- Cork Grants, Deductions from, in Respect of Land Purchase, *Apr. 30*, 666, 669, 707, 708.
- County and Borough Council Grants, Deductions from in Respect of Land Purchase, *Apr. 30*, 666, 707 ; *May 1*, 891.
- County Councils, Names of, and Arrangements made with Banks by, *May 2*, 1050.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Crannagh Farm
  - Clooney Sacred Society, Alleged Threatening Letter from, *May 1,* 880.
  - Tenants, Present Position of, *Apr. 24,* 59.
- Delmege Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 29,* 514.
- De Montalt Estate Untenanted Lands, Purchase and Disposal of, *May 6,* 1323.
- Downpatrick Rural District Council Resolution as to Sales of Old Clothes from Belfast on Fair Days, *Apr. 25,* 255.
- Dowra Disturbances of 19th February—Reason for Discharge of Accused Persons, *Apr. 24,* 62.
- Dublin Metropolitan Police
  - Cox, Sergeant, Conduct of, in Licensing Prosecution, *Apr. 24,* 22.
  - Criminal Charges Manufactured by, alleged, *May 2,* 1107, 1108.
  - Numerical Strength in Excess of Requirements, Alleged, *May 2,* 1107, 1108, 1109.
  - Rates Levied for upkeep, Exorbitant Nature of, alleged, *May 2,* 1106–1109.
  - Reason for Comparative Paucity of Protestants, *Apr. 24,* 21.
- Edenderry Poor Law Guardians—Circumstances of Accepting Tenders for Drugs, *Apr. 24,* 55.
- Education
  - Expenditure, Information as to, *Apr. 24,* 23.
  - Inspectors
    - Appeals against and Applications for Reinspection, *May 6,* 1322.
    - Transfer, Regulations for and Allegations as to Unfavourable First Reports made, *Apr. 24,* 9.
  - Intermediate
    - Grants Paid and Number of Students passing (1900–6), *May 1,* 848, 850, 889.
    - Inspection System, Decision as to, *May 1,* 886.
  - National School Teachers
    - Daily Report Book, Personal Details inserted in, *Apr. 26,* 386.
    - Salaries, Incidence of Paying, *May 1,* 856.
    - School Building Plans, Decision as to, *May 1,* 878.
    - Secondary System, Necessity for Improving, *May 1,* 887.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
- Elphin Disturbance of 14th April—Measures Taken to Preserve Peace, *May 1,* 874.
- Evans Estate—Lodging of Request under Section 40 of Act, *Apr. 26,* 385.
- Evictions
  - Lunatics, Application of Act to—Cases of C. Mullen and C. M‘ Donagh, *May 1,* 872.
  - Reinstatements, Progress made with, *May 1,* 890.
    - Delay Caused by Removal of Inspectors, *May 1,* 877.
- Fay Estates—Application of Section 40 of Land Act, 1896, *Apr. 24,* 53.
- Fisheries
  - Amendment of Law proposed, *Apr. 29,* 511.
  - Irish Cured Fish, Brand for—Date of Publishing Evidence, *Apr. 24,* 58.
- Ffrench Estate, Purchase Proposals for, *Apr. 24,* 49.
- French Estate, Tipperary, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 24,* 50.
- Galway
  - County Council Grant, Information as to Deductions from, *May 6,* 1313.
  - Graziers, Protection of—Threatening Resolution Passed by Clonfert United Irish League, *May 2,* 1076.
- Gargrie Labourers' Cottage—Application of J. Reilly, *May 1,* 883.
- Gawran—Case of T. Gaffney, *Apr. 25,* 285, 286.
- Geevagh Band—Circumstances of Firing Gun by Conlon, *Apr. 25,* 253.
- Gublaun—Police Duties in Preserving Peace, Latest Occasion of Exercising, *Apr. 25,* 233.
- Inchinasingane — Rent Recovery Proceedings in Bankruptcy Courts, Custom as to, *Apr. 24,* 63.
- Irish Education Act, 1892, Disposal of Fines under, *May 6,* 1321.
- Irish Language, Proposals for Teaching in Schools, *May 1,* 885.
- Kenmare Estate—Reinstatement Claim of D. O'Shea, *May 6,* 1323.
- Keogh Estate, Purchase of, proposed, *Apr. 25,* 284.
- Kerry
  - Poor Law Unions—Salaries Paid to Medical Officers, *May 1,* 854.
  - Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, Progress made with, *Apr. 24,* 47.
- Kildare Grant, Information as to Deductions from, *Apr. 25,* 234.

[*cont.*

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

- Killarney—Attack on Lord Kenmare's Bailiffs on 27th April, *May 1*, 886.
- Killarney Lake—Regulations for Licensing Boats, etc., *Apr. 24*, 56.
- Killna Castle Untenanted Lands, Purchase of, proposed, *May 1*, 871.
- Kilmallock Labourers' Cottages Applications, Rejection of, *Apr. 25*, 234.
- Kiltyclogher—Reinstatement Claim of W. M'Gowan, *May 2*, 1051.
- King Harman Estate—Holdings Purchased by M'Drury, *May 1*, 888.
- King's County Malicious Injury Cases, Cause and Number of—Cases Attributed to Vagrants, *Apr. 24*, 48, 49.
- Knocklong Labourers' Cottages Applications, Complaints as to Manner of Dealing with, *Apr. 24*, 51.
- Labourers Acts
  - Administration of, Delay in Erecting Cottages, Reason for Increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1160, 1161.
  - Allotments under, Granting Powers to District Councils, proposed, *May 2*, 1148.
  - Cottages
    - Applicants, Rejected, Right of Complaint by, *Apr. 24*, 58.
    - Circumstances under which Erection is Sanctioned, *Apr. 29*, 500.
- Lambert Minors Estate, Sale Proposals for, *May 2*, 1073.
- Lamphiere Estate—Reinstatement Claims of P. Cormach and J. Feehan, *Apr. 26*, 383.
- Land Act, 1903, Transactions under, *Apr. 29*, 516.
- Land Commission
  - Clerks, Classification, Salaries and Duties of, *May 1*, 851–853.
  - Pink Schedule, Information recorded in, *May 1*, 870.
- Land Purchase
  - Funds, Condition of, and Balance remaining in Hand, *Apr. 2*, 56, 57.
  - Inspectors, System of Employing—Number working in County Cork, *Apr. 24*, 47.
  - Proceedings, Expediting of, proposed, *May 1*, 876.
  - Report, Date of Presenting, *May 1*, 871.
  - Transactions in course of being dealt with, *Apr. 24*, 58.
- Land Purchase Act, 1891—Proposals for making Rules under Section 2, *Apr. 26*, 375.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*

- Leader Estate—Reinstatement Claim of Mr. A. Connell, *Apr. 30*, 670.
- Lettermore Distress Committee, Constitution of, *May 2*, 1074.
- Lisevine—Reinstatement Claim of J. Barry, *May 1*, 882.
- Local Government Board
  - Expenditure by, Increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1160.
  - Tenders for Contracts, System of Surcharging Boards of Guardians, *May 2*, 1148, 1149.
- Longfield Estate—Case of D. Lehane, *Apr. 25*, 253.
- Longford County Council Grant, Deduction from, *May 1*, 885.
- Longford Pass—Reinstatement Claims of Mr. Morris and Kealy, *May 6*, 1305.
- Loughry Manor, Acquisition of, and Use for, *Apr. 25*, 254.
- Low Estate, Sale Proposals for, *May 1*, 873.
- Lunacy—Expenditure on Asylums in 1906, *Apr. 30*, 709, 710.
- Maconchy Estate Turbary Trustee — Reason for Removal of Mr. M. Kiernan, *May 1*, 884.
- Magistrates, Resident, Names, Ages, etc., of, *May 3*, 1167.
- Messengers appointed to Irish Government Offices, *Apr. 29*, 501.
- Muckross Barytes Mines, Report on, *May 6*, 1313.
- Mullaghavourneen—Reason for Detention of Receivable Order of P. Casey, *May 6*, 1314.
- Mullaghmore Fish-curing Station, Decision as to Establishing, *Apr. 29*, 512.
- Murphy, D., and Mr. O'Sullivan, Inquiry into Cases of, *Apr. 24*, 46.
- Newtownards—Woman Charged with Larceny, Cause of Supply of Whisky to, *Apr. 24*, 27.
- O'Donovan Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 25*, 286.
- O'Rorke Estate, Purchase Proposals for, *Apr. 29*, 512.
- Oranmore—Disturbance at House of P. Burke, *May 2*, 1075.
- Phibbs Estate, Purchase and Disposal of, *Apr. 25*, 231.
- Poor Law
  - Children
    - Extension of Boarding-out System, proposed, *May 2*, 1148.
  - Dispensary Doctors, Salaries of, and Source of Contributions towards, *Apr. 24*, 20.
  - Reform, Proposals for, *Apr. 30*, 712; *May 6*, 1315.
  - Returns as to Pauperism, Necessity for and Work Involved in Preparing, *Apr. 29*, 515.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
Public Accounts, Charges for Audit of, *May 2*, 1160, 1161.
Public Trustee Act—Extension to Ireland, proposed, *Apr. 30*, 680.
Questions asked on Irish Matters—Imputation in Speech at Halifax, *Apr. 29*, 545; *May 1*, 898.
Rates—Number of Persons Struck off Voters List for Non-Payment of Poor Rate, *Apr. 29*, 501.
Rathkeale District Council, Charges of Extravagance against, *May 6*, 1315.
Religious Persuasion of Officials, *May 3*, 1170.
Roman Catholic University, Legislative Proposals for—Protests Received from Universities and Colleges, *Apr. 24*, 52; *Apr. 25*, 283, 284.
Roscommon, Intimidatory Processions in—Instructions to Police, *May 1*, 874.
Salmon Fisheries Advisory Committee, Constitution of, *Apr. 29*, 510.
Sarsfield Estate—Proposals for Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, *Apr. 24*, 61.
Skibbereen—Election of Drimoleague Dispensary Doctor, *May 1*, 879.
Sligo Grants, Deductions from, in Respect of Land Purchase, *Apr. 30*, 664, 668, 707; *May 1*, 890.
Smythe, Col., Estate of—Reinstatement Claim of E. Fagan, *Apr. 24*, 43.
Springtown—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. A. Smyth, *May 1*, 883.
Swine, Irish—Protests against Restrictions on Importation into England, *May 1*, 884.
Tipperary Constabulary Force, Religion of, *Apr. 24*, 21.
Tongalee—Case of Mr. Beirne, *Apr. 24*, 53.
Tottenham Estate—Case of Mrs. Dolan, *Apr. 24*, 22.
Trade Statistics—Date of Presenting Report, *Apr. 24*, 57.
Ulster
  Magistrates, Number and Religion of, *May 6*, 1312.
  Population—Decrease since 1841, *Apr. 26*, 382.
Upperlands—Outrage at House of Mr. W. Tomb, Prosecution of Arrested Persons, etc., *May 1*, 855.
Wandesforde Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 30*, 711.
Waterville Industrial Class-room, Acquisition of Site for, *Apr. 24*, 48.
Wexford
  Grant, Deductions from, in respect of Land Purchase, *Apr. 30*, 666, 679, 707.
  Land Purchase—Expediting Proceedings proposed, *Apr. 24*, 51.

Birrell, Rt. Hon. A.—*cont.*
Wynne Estate—Case of P. Sweeny, *Apr. 26*, 384.

Bishopstone
Church, Consecration of.
  Q. Capt. Faber; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 6*, 1316, 1317.

Blacklion
Boycott of Mr. Taylor, Cause of.
  Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 45.

Blennerhasset Estate
Sale Proposals for—Rent Decrees issued, etc.
  Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. T. O'Donnell; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 877, 878.

Bobbinite
Report and Minutes of Evidence Presented, *May 1*, 822, 843.

Boland, Mr. J. P. [Kerry, S.]
Blennerhasset Estate, Sale Proposals for and Rent Decrees issued, *May 1*, 877.
Cooscroum Boat Slip, Decision as to, *Apr. 24*, 57.
Fish, Irish Cured, Brand for, Date of Publishing Evidence, *Apr. 24*, 57.
Irish Trade Statistics—Date of Presenting Report, *Apr. 24*, 57.
Local Government Board—Tenders for Contracts, System of Surcharging Boards of Guardians, *May 2*, 1144–1147.
Poor Law Children—Extension of Boarding-out System in Ireland, proposed, *May 2*, 1143.
Waterville Industrial Class-room, Acquisition of Site for, *Apr. 24*, 48.

Borax Consolidated Bill
c. 2R.* *Apr.* 29, 488.

Boston Spa Gas Bill
*c. Con.** *Apr. 26*, 373.
  3R.* *Apr. 30*, 661.
l. 1R.* *May 1*, 821.

Bottomley, Mr. H. W. [Hackney, S.]
Income-tax—Separate Assessment of Incomes of Married Persons, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 122.
Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R. *Apr. 26*, 429–434.
Suicides and Others, Letters Written by, Making Charges Against Persons—Desirability of Preventing Publication, *Apr. 25*, 282.

Bournville
Postmen, Sunday Pay of.
  Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 30*, 701.

Bowerman, Mr. C. W. [Deptford]
  Customs Watchers, Overtime Payment of, *Apr. 25*, 247.
  Telegraph Office, Central—Decision as to Changes in Duties of Examining Messages, *May 1*, 846.

Bowles, Mr. G. S. [Lambeth, Norwood]
  British Museum Reading Room, Redecoration of—Method of Calling for Tenders, *Apr. 25*, 281.
  Canada—Regulations as to Vaccination of Immigrants, *May 1*, 866.
  Curtailment of Debate and Interference with Liberties of the House, Objections to, *May 6*, 1405.
  Death Duties, Revenue from—Increase for 1906–7, *Apr. 24*, 106.
  Egypt—Allocation of Contract for raising Assouan Dam, *Apr. 30*, 693, 694.
  Income Tax
    Earned Incomes up to £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, *Apr. 24*, 110–112.
    Evasions—Increase of Penalties and Extension of Period for Recovery, *Apr. 24*, 111.
    Graduation—Report and Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 24*, 110.
    Returns
      Compulsory Filling up of Forms, Proposals as to, *Apr. 24*, 111.
      Employers to give Particulars of all Salaries paid, *Apr. 24*, 111.
  Mesopotamia—Concessions of Oil Deposits, *Apr. 25*, 265.
  National Debt
    New Sinking Fund, Addition to, out of Surplus Revenue, *Apr. 24*, 108, 109.
    Reduction, Provision for, *Apr. 24*, 108, 109.
  Parliamentary Procedure—Proposals for dealing with Blocking Bills and Motions, *May 6*, 1362.
  Persian National Bank, German Assistance in Establishment of, *Apr. 25*, 266.
  Revenue and Expenditure
    Surplus and Revenue from (1906–7), *Apr. 24*, 106, 107.
    Total Expenditure for 1906–7, *Apr. 24*, 107, 108.
  Taxation, Local—Assigned Revenue intercepted from the Treasury, Abolition of System, *Apr. 24*, 109, 110.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Allocation of Time to various Stages, Proposals as to, *May 6*, 1406.

Boyle
  Postman, Allowance to, for use of Pony.
    Q. Mr. James O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 6*, 1304.

Bramsdon, Mr. T. A. [Portsmouth]
  Naval Dockyards—Lead-poisoning Cases during 1906, *Apr. 25*, 231.
  Portsmouth Dockyard—Rate of Wages paid to Labourers by Contractors, *May 2*, 1036.

Brassey, Lord
  Navy
    Casualties to Vessels—Returns as to, *May 1*, 828.
    Pilotage and Navigation, Extension of Courses for Junior Officers, proposed, *May 1*, 828.

Brecon and Merthyr Tydvil Junction Railway Bill
  c. Rep. Apr. 25*, 228.
  Con. May 3*, 1165.

Bridgeman, Mr. W. C. [Shropshire, Oswestry]
  Burwell Farm—Expenditure on adapting to Requirements of Small Holders, *May 2*, 1070.
  Jamaica—Publication of Correspondence as to Resignation of Sir A. Swettenham, *Apr. 30*, 690, 691.

Brighouse Corporation Bill
  c. Con. Apr. 30*, 661.
  3R.* *May 3*, 1165.
  l. 1R.* *May 6*, 1202.

Bright, Mr. J. A. [Oldham]
  London Municipal Society, Subscription to, by London and North-Western Railway, *Apr. 25*, 363, 364.
  London and North-Western Railway Bil, 2R. *Apr. 25*, 363.

Bristol
  Postal Mail Van Drivers, House of Duty and Wages of.
    Q. Mr. O'Grady; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 25*, 276, 277.

Bristol Corporation Bill
  c. Rep. Apr. 25*, 228.
  Con. May 2*, 1033.
  3R.* *May 6*, 1299.

British Columbia
  Immigration Bill, Subject of.
    Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 1*, 866.

British Museum
Reading Room, Redecoration of
Calling for Tenders, Method of.
Qs. Mr. Bowles, Mr. J. Ward, Mr. Lea; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 25*, 281.
Gold-Leaf of British Manufacture. Reason for requiring.
Q. Mr. Haddock; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 29*, 498, 499.

Brooke, Mr. G. S. [Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley]
Agriculture Department Vice-President
Inadvisability of making Change in Present Tenure before presenting of Report of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 25*, 144–147.
Office to be a Ministerial and Parliamentary one, and to be vacated on a Change of Government, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 146.

Brora
Mackay, Mr. D., Reason for Delay in replying to Applications of.
Q. Mr. James O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 6*, 1303.

Brosna
Outrage at House of Forde, Cause for.
Q. Mr. Moore; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 2*, 1076.

Browne Estate
Sale Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 286.

Brunner, Mr. J. F. L. [Lancashire, S.W.]
Magistrates, Poor Law Guardians as—Right to Adjudicate in certain Cases, *Apr. 29*, 505.

Buckhaven Dock Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *May 2*, 994.

Budget
Resolutions, Opportunity for Discussion of.
Os. Mr. Asquith, Mr. A. Chamberlain, *May 1*, 955, 956.

Bull, Sir W. J. [Hammersmith]
Alderney Abbatoir, Decision as to, *Apr. 25*, 246.
Customs Statistical Office Clerks, Reply to Memorial from, *Apr. 24*, 25.
Income Tax
Assessment Forms for 1907, Reason for Use of in London, *Apr. 29*, 490.
Separate Assessment of Incomes of Married Persons, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 119.

Bull, Sir W. J.—*cont.*
London Traffic Board, Proposals for Establishing, *Apr. 24*, 69.
Meat
Importation, Proposals for regulating, *Apr. 24*, 36.
Imports from Argentina and United States in 1906, *May 1*, 857.

Burke, Mr. F. H. [King's County, Tullamore].
King's County, Malicious Injury Cases, Cause and Number of—Cases attributed to Vagrants, *Apr. 24*, 48.

Burnley Corporation Bill
c. *Rep.** *Apr. 25*, 228.
*Con.** *Apr. 30*, 661.
3R.* *May 3*, 1165.
l. 1R.* *May 6*, 1202.

Burnham (Somerset) Pier Bill
c. 2R.* *May 6*, 1299.
Report of Board of Trade Ordered, *May 2*, 1036; Presented, *May 3*, 1166.

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*President of the Local Government Board* [Battersea]
Easington Poor Law Guardians, Co-option of Member by, *May 2*, 1065.
Germany, Origin of Vaccine Lymph used in, *Apr. 30*, 699.
Housing of the Working Classes—Legislative Proposals as to Transfer of Powers from Rural District Councils, *Apr. 24*, 38, 39.
Ipswich Poor Law Labour Yard, Reason for closing, *May 2*, 1047.
Local Authorities' Employees, Application of Workmen's Compensation Act to, *May 2*, 1047.
London
Drainage, Combined, Cost of Maintaining—Amendment of Law, proposed, *Apr. 30*, 700.
Rates, Proposals for Equalisation of, *Apr. 29*, 533.
Lunacy Grant under Local Government Act—Extension to Workhouse Patients proposed, *May 2*, 1049.
Motors—Royal Commission Recommendations, Action proposed to be taken on, *Apr. 29*, 498.
Newark Poor Law Guardians, Wages paid by, to Persons seeking Employment, *May 2*, 1048.
Parish Electors in Scotland, Information as to, *Apr. 25*, 283.
Poor Law
Children
Number dependent on Poor Relief, *Apr. 24*, 25.
Workhouses and Infirmaries, Number in, *Apr. 25*, 250.

[*cont.*

Burns, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
        Commission, Scope of and Returns called for by, *May 2*, 1066.
        Ireland—Payment for Work entailed in preparing Pauperism Returns, proposed, *Apr. 30*, 700.
        Married Applicants for Relief, Production of Marriage Certificate by—Practice in Kensington and Bethnal Green, *Apr. 24*, 26.
    Sandgate—Religious Ministrations provided for Jones's Homes, *Apr. 29*, 533,
    Sutherland—Danger arising from Dog-Poisoning in Neighbourhood of Badininish, *Apr. 25*, 283.
    Towns and Cities
        Development of—Granting Powers to Local Authorities to lay out Suburbs on Rational Lines, *May 1*, 987–990.
        Garden Cities and Model Villages, Results of Experiments with. *May 1*, 988, 989.
    Tynemouth Poor Law Guardians, Co-option of Member by, *May 2*, 1065.
    Vaccination Bill, Date of Presenting, *Apr. 30*, 699.
    Vaccination Order, Cause for Delay in Issue of, *Apr. 29*, 507.
    Workmen's Compensation Act—Legality of Charge for insuring Parish Council Clerk and Overseer, *Apr. 29*, 534.

Burwell Farm
    Small Holders, Expenditure on adapting to Requirements.
        Qs. Mr. Bridgeman; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 2*, 1070, 1071.

Business of the House
    Course of
        Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Mr. J. Redmond, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 25*, 290, 291; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H. Vincent, *Apr. 30*, 714; Mr. A. J. Balfour, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Viscount Turnour, *May 2*, 1085, 1086.

Butcher, Mr. S. H. [Cambridge University]
    Agriculture Department—Vice-President
        Inadvisability of making Change in Present Tenure before Presenting of Report of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 24*, 155, 158.
        Office to be a Ministerial and Parliamentary one, and to be vacated on a change of Government, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 155.
        Plunkett, Sir H., Reasons for Retention in Office—Local Opinion in Ireland, etc., *Apr. 24*, 154–159.

Butter and Margarine Bill
    Salt Firkin Butter, Effect on.
        Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 2*, 1077.

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*Postmaster-General* [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]
    Ballingarry Postmistress, Refusal of Letters addressed to, *Apr. 30*, 714.
    Bournville Postmen, Sunday Pay of, *Apr. 30*, 701.
    Boyle Postman, Allowance to, for Use of Pony, *May 6*, 1304.
    Bristol Mail Van Drivers, Hours of Duty and Wages of, *Apr. 25*, 277.
    Brora—Reason for Delay in replying to Applications of Mr. D. Mackay, *May 6*, 1303.
    Chief Medical Officer, Salary of, *May 1*, 845.
    Christmas Supplements, Facilities for Transmission of, *May 6*, 1303.
    Crouch End Telephone Exchange, Date of opening, *May 2*, 1038.
    Dernakesh Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 244.
    Dublin Post Office, Proposals for rebuilding, *Apr. 25*, 243.
    Eastern District Post Office, Full Time Casual Sorters employed in, *Apr. 25*, 243.
    Gortnahoctee Postman, Assault on, *Apr. 30*, 714.
    Ireland, Stores in—Position of Staff under New Arrangements, *May 6*, 1316.
    Killeenan Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *Apr. 25*, 232.
    Kingscourt Post Office Extension, Building of, *Apr. 26*, 376.
    Lerwick Telegraph Staff, Allowance to, for Knowledge of Danish, proposed, *May 6*, 1351.
    Mail Service—Australian Contract Arrangements, *May 2*, 1067, 1068.
    Nantwich—Employment of Relation of Postmaster, *May 2*, 1046.
    Overseers in London Service, Qualifications required of, *May 6*, 1350.
    Parcels Post, Rule as to sealing of Registered Packets, *May 1*, 869.
    Plymouth Post Office Revision, Date of carrying out, *May 6*, 1303.
    Robertstown Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *May 2*, 1046.
    Rockchapel Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *May 2*, 1037.
    Savings Bank Annuities, Provisions as to Compounding for, *May 2*, 1037.
    Sick Leave and Pay Regulations, *May 2*, 1067.

[*cont.*

Buxton, Rt. Hon. S. C.—*cont.*
  Sorters—Proposals for Abolishing Open Competition, *Apr. 26*, 376.
  Telegraph Service
    Central Office—Decision as to Changes in Duties of Examining Messages, *May 1*, 846.
    Ex-Soldiers, Proposals for Employing, *Apr. 24*, 7, 8.
  Wareham Post Office—Case of Mr. Best, *May 6*, 1350.
  Welsh Language, Rule as to Addresses in, *May 2*, 1066.

Byles, Mr. W. P. [Salford, N.]
  Aliens and British Criminals, Proportion of, to Population, *Apr. 29*, 531.
  Compulsory Weighing and Measurements Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1184.
  Hague Conference—Instructions to be given to British Delegates, *Apr. 25*, 268.
  Lewisham Schools Rifle Association, Information as to, *May 6*, 1309.
  Military Instruction in Schools, Decision as to, *May 6*, 1309.
  Salonica—Repayment of Mr. Abbott's Ransom by Turkish Government, *May 6*, 1344, 1345.
  Seaweed, Right of certain Landlords to claim as private Property, *May 6*, 1354.
  Transvaal Chinese Labour
    Unlicensed Coolies, Circumstances of Admitting, *May 6*, 1337, 1343.

Byrne's Divorce Bill
  l. Royal Assent, *Apr. 29*, 461.

Cabs
  Privilege Cab System, Progress of Negotiations as to.
    Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 25*, 271.

Caldbeck Estate
  Sale Proposals, Cause for Delay in.
    Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6*, 1321, 1322.

Calico
  Dressing used in Manufacturing—Cause of Death of Ann Wilson.
    Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 30*, 696.

Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M. [Dublin University]
  Labourers Acts, Administration of—Delay in erecting Cottages, Reason for increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1157–1159.

Campbell, Rt. Hon. J. H. M.—*cont.*
  Local Government Board
    Expenditure by, increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1157.
    Tenders for Contracts, System of Surcharging Boards of Guardians, *May 2*, 1159, 1160.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*First Lord of the Treasury* [Stirling Burghs]
  Agriculture Instruction—Proposals for Coordination of Work of Boards of Education and Agriculture, *Apr. 25*, 289.
  Business of the House, Course of, *Apr. 25*, 291; *Apr. 30*, 714; *May 2*, 1085, 1086.
  Business Committee, Establishment of, proposed, *May 6*, 1369.
  Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Procedure with, *Apr. 25*, 274.
  Colonial Conference, 1907
    Preference Resolutions
      Chancellor of the Exchequer, Responsibility for Publishing Speech of, *May 6*, 1359.
      Deakin, Mr. A.—Speech of—Publication of full Report, proposed, *May 6*, 1359.
      Publication and Tabling of Speeches, *May 6*, 1358, 1359.
    Proceedings, Arrangements for Publishing, *Apr. 25*, 262, 263; *Apr. 29*, 546; *May 1*, 895, 896; *May 6*, 1360.
  Colonial Parliamentary Systems—Inquiry into Reasons for Omission of Chamber of Hereditary and Spiritual Members, proposed, *May 2*, 1080.
  Colonies, British Capital invested in and Proposals for advancing Development of, *May 2*, 1079.
  Committees, Standing—Allegations as to Laxity of Attendance of Members, *May 2*, 1080.
  Court of Criminal Appeal Bill—Date of Taking Second Reading, *Apr. 29*, 545.
  Defence of the Empire—Mediterranean Defences Committee, Names of Members of, *May 2*, 1083.
  Ecclesiastical Disorders, Failure of Episcopal Authorities to deal with, *Apr. 29*, 497.
  Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, Proposals as to, *May 2*, 1082.
  Education, Scotland—Publication of Names of Ministers and Dates of Meetings of Committee of Privy Council, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 290.
  Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill, Proposals as to, *May 2*, 1082.
  Egypt, Unrest in—Connection with Lahore Disturbance, *May 1*, 861.

[*cont.*

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—*cont.*
- Empire Day, Official Recognition of, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 288.
- Feeble-Minded Persons—Date of Presenting Commission Report, *Apr. 29*, 546.
- Gambling in Shares, Protection of *bona fide* Investors from, proposed, *Apr. 29*, 516.
- Hague Conference Disarmament Proposals—Effect of German Attitude on British Expenditure on Armaments, *May 6*, 1356.
- Ireland
  - Administration, Legislative Proposals as to, *Apr. 25*, 290.
  - Agriculture Department
    - Vice-President
      - Plunkett, Sir H., Resignation of and Reasons for Retention in Office, *Apr. 24*, 171, 172; *Apr. 29*, 546.
      - Qualifications Required of, *May 2*, 1081.
  - Education, Intermediate—Facilities for Parliamentary Discussion, *May 2*, 1082.
  - Land Purchase—Financial Working, Inquiry into or Opportunity for Discussion, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 67, 68.
- Irish Council Bill—Time Allotted to First Reading Debate, *May 6*, 1361, 1362.
- Land Policy of the Government, *Apr. 29*, 547.
- Land Transfers, Sales and Mortgages, Costs Incurred in—Return proposed, *May 2*, 1081.
- Land Valuation (Scotland) Bill, Date of Introducing, *May 6*, 1360.
- Liquor Traffic—Proposals for Legislation, *Apr. 25*, 256.
- Local Authorities, Legislative Proposals for Enabling Women to Serve on, *May 2*, 1079.
- London
  - Streets, Proposals for Regulating Tearing-up of, *Apr. 24*, 70.
  - Traffic Board, Proposals for Establishing, *Apr. 24*, 70.
- Lord Chamberlain, Minister Responsible to the House for Action or Inaction of, *May 4*, 1348.
- Messengers Appointed to Government Offices, *Apr. 25*, 288.
- Moray Firth, Trawling in—Reason for Prosecuting British Subjects in Subordinate Positions on Foreign Vessels, *Apr. 40*, 682.
- Naval Policy as to Increase of Power, *Apr. 25*, 289.
- Navy Estimates—Date of Taking Vote 8, *May 2*, 1078.

Campbell-Bannerman, Rt. Hon. Sir H.—
- Pacific Islanders Act—Proposals for Amendment, *May 6*, 1362.
- Parliamentary Procedure
  - Blocking Bills and Motions, Proposals for Dealing with, *Apr. 24*, 69; *May 6*, 1362, 1363.
  - Session, Alteration in Period for, proposed, *May 2*, 1083, 1084.
- Political Pensions, Declaration Required of Applicants for, *May 6*, 1362.
- Political Pensions Bill, Facilities for Passage of, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 287.
- Portsmouth, Earl of—Allegations as to Harsh Treatment of Tenants, *Apr. 29*, 539; *May 1*, 893, 894.
  - Parliamentary Discussion, Opportunity for, *May 6*, 1360, 1361.
- Rights of Way, Proposals for Preservation of, *Apr. 29*, 547.
- Roman Catholic University, Proposals as to, *Apr. 25*, 289.
- Sheriff Court Civil Procedure Bill—Date of Taking Second Reading, *Apr. 25*, 256.
- Small Holdings, Acquisition of Land for—Official Evidence of Difficulty Experienced in, *Apr. 24*, 11, 71.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill 2R. *Apr. 29*, 626–627; *Apr. 30*, 717, 803–810.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill
  - Allocation of Time to Various Stages, Proposals as to, *May 6*, 1367–1374.
  - System of Appointing Lords Lieutenant, Proposals for Altering, *May 6*, 1356.
- Treasury, Secretary to—Date of taking Vote for Salary, *Apr. 25*, 289.
- Universities—Inquiry into Finances, Government, etc., proposed, *May 6*, 1358.
- United States—New York Peace Congress, Information as to, *Apr. 24*, 69.
- Vagrancy, Proposals for dealing with, *May 6*, 1357.
- Valuation Bills, Provisions of, *Apr. 24*, 70.
- Welsh Church Commission—Proposals for Filling Vacancies, *Apr. 24*, 72.
- Women—Proposals for Legislation to Empower Service on Local Bodies, *Apr. 24*, 29.

Camperdown, Earl of
- Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 477.
- Small Holdings—Tabling Answers received to Circulars issued by County Councils, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 219–222.

Canada
(*See also names of States as* British Columbia)
Immigrants, Regulations as to Vaccination of.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 1*, 866, 867.
Iron and Steel Manufactures, Import of—Effect of New Tariff on British Goods.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 29*, 492.
Negotiations with Foreign Powers, Proper Channels for.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 264, 265.
Tariff
Arrangements with Foreign Powers—Effect on British Preferential Tariff.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 264.
British Goods, Rate on.
Qs. Mr. P. Pease; *As.* Mr. Kearley, *Apr. 25*, 277.

Canal Tolls and Charges (New Junction Canal) Order Confirmation Bill
l. 2R.* *May 6*, 1202.

Cape Colony
Simon's Bay Naval Dockyard, Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 296, 337; Sir F. Banbury, 312, 343; Mr. Ashley, 316.

Carlile, Mr. E. H. [Herts, St. Albans]
Africa, East—Date of Summoning Capt. Grogan, Authority for Issue of Summonses, etc., *Apr. 29*, 527, 528.
Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26*, 435–437.
Rifle Clubs, Issue of Old Rifles to, proposed, *Apr. 29*, 518.

Carnarvon Castle
Expenditure on, during last Ten Years.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 26*, 382.

Carr-Gomm, Mr. H. W. [Southwark, Rotherhithe]
Money-Lenders Act, 1900, Proposals for Amending, *May 6*, 1302.

Carrick-on-Shannon
Disturbance—Circumstance of Striking of Mr. Cooney by Constable.
Q. Mr. J. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 887, 888.

Carrington, Earl—*President of the Board of Agriculture*
Destructive Insects and Pests Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 471.

Carrington, Earl—*cont.*
Municipal Representation Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 651, 652.
Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 472, 473, 476, 477.
Small Holdings
Circular Issued by County Councils—Tabling Answer received to, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 221.
Crown Lands, Experiments made with, *Apr. 25*, 201, 202.
Demand for—Substantiation of Allegations as to Attitude of Landowners, etc., proposed, *Apr. 25*, 196–203.
Experiments made by Earl Carrington, Statement as to, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 197.
Official Returns as to—Tabling fuller Information, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 195.
Papers relating to, Date of Tabling, *May 2*, 996.
Speech by Prime Minister at Holborn Restaurant, Terms of, *Apr. 25*, 196, 203.

Cartridges
Illegal Storage in Certain Northern Towns, Information as to.
Q. Viscount Turnour; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 6*, 1350.

Castlereagh, Viscount [Maidstone]
Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26*, 403–406.

Castleton
Inquiry as to Need for Small Holdings, proposed.
Q. Mr. Smeaton; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 6*, 1352.

Cattle
Irish, Allegations as to Fraudulent Sale of inferior English Animals as—Measures proposed for Prevention.
Q. Mr. A. Roche; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 49.

Cavan
Fitzpatrick, P., Reinstatement Claim of
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 26*, 385.
Urban Council Byelaws—Number submitted and Position in each Case.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6*, 1314.

Cave, Mr. G. [Surrey, Kingston]
Aliens—Naturalisation Certificates granted in 1906, and Proposals for reducing Fees, *Apr. 24*, 27.
Army Engineer Services—Decision as to Surveyors' Salaries, *May 1*, 861.
Richmond Park Road from Richmond Hill Gate to Kingston Gate—Date of completing Repairs, *May 1*, 859.

Cavendish, Rt. Hon. V. C. W. [Derbyshire, W.]
- Education—Welsh Department, Financial Proposals in Connection with, *Apr. 24*, 94.
- Income Tax
  - Earned Incomes up to £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 92.
  - Graduation—Report and Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 24*, 90, 91.
- Liquor Traffic, Reform Proposals, *Apr. 24*, 93.
- Motors, Increase of Taxation on, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 92.
- Public Accounts Committee Reports, allowing Opportunity for Discussion of, *Apr. 24*, 95.
- Taxation, Local—Assigned Revenue intercepted from the Treasury, Abolition of System, *Apr. 24*, 92, 95.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill
  - Financial Resolution, Exemption of from Closure, proposed, *May 6*, 1419–1422.
  - Financial Proposals in Connection with, *Apr. 24*, 94, 95.

Cawdor, Earl
- Defence of the Empire—Dissemination of News in time of War, Government Control over, etc., *Apr. 29*, 482.
- House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1216–1223.
- Navy
  - Docking Accommodation for large Vessels of "Dreadnought" Type, etc., *May 1*, 826–828.
  - Home Fleet
    - Ammunition to be issued to, Information as to, *May 1*, 824, 833.
    - Commander-in-Chief of Channel Fleet, Control over, *May 1*, 823, 833.
    - Constitution of, Manning and Efficiency of Squadrons at the Nore, etc., *May 1*, 822–824.
    - Destroyers, Bases for, *May 1*, 836, 837.
  - Nucleus Crews, Working of System, *May 1*, 826.
  - Repairs—State of Ships of the Fleet in January, 1905 and 1907, Statement as to, proposed, *May 1*, 822, 824–826.
  - Rosyth, Policy as to, *May 1*, 827.
- Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 477.

Cawley, Sir F. [Lancashire, Prestwich]
- Limited Partnerships Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1196.

Cecil, Lord R. [Marylebone, E.]
- Bills—Resolutions dealing with Allocation of time for Particular Bills, inexpediency of, *May 6*, 1396–1399.
- Curtailment of Debate and Interference with Liberties of the House, Objections to, *May 6*, 1397.
- Feeble-minded Persons—Date of Presenting Commission Report, *Apr. 29*, 545.
- Glamorganshire Schools, Reason for increase in Cost of Maintaining, *Apr. 25*, 276.
- Parliamentary Procedure—Proposals for dealing with Blocking Bills and Motions, *Apr. 24*, 69; *May 6*, 1362, 1363.
- Portsmouth, Earl of—Allegations as to Harsh Treatment of Tenant, *May 1*, 893, 894.
  - Opportunity for Discussion, *May 5*, 1360, 1361.
- Schools, Expenditure of Public Money on Erecting—Legislative Proposals, *May 6*, 1309.
- Tea Duty, Reduction of, to 4d. per pound, proposed, *May 1*, 923, 924.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Allocation of Time to Various Stages, Proposals as to, *May 6*, 1396–1399.

Cecil, Mr. E. [Aston Manor]
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Procedure with, *Apr. 25*, 273, 274.

Central London Railway Bill
- *c.* 2R., *May 6*, 1432.

Ceylon
- Coolie Children, Facilities for Education of.
  - *Q.* Sir C. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 30*, 692, 693.
  - *Q.* Mr. H Beach; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 2*, 1059.

Chairman and Deputy Chairman
- Amendment being still before the House, Division must be taken before General Discussion could Proceed, *Apr. 24*, 122.
- Imputation of Motives, *May 2*, 1162.
- Matter Irrelevant to Subject under Discussion, Introduction of, *Apr. 24*, 130; *May 1*, 918, 923, 939, 940, 942, 945, 960; *May 2*, 1141, 1158.
- Navy Estimates
  - Discussion Permissible where Reduction of the Vote had been moved, *Apr. 25*, 312.
  - Matter Irrelevant to Vote under Discussion, *Apr. 25*, 334.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. A. [Worcestershire, E.]
  Budget Resolutions, Opportunity for Discussion of, *May 1*, 955, 956.
  Colonial Conference Proceedings, Decision as to Publication of, *May 1*, 895.
  Tea Duty, Reduction of, to 4d. per pound, proposed, *May 1*, 907–909.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill,
    Clauses 5–40, Allowing Extra Day for Discussion of, proposed, *May 6*, 1454.
    Financial Resolution, Exemption of from Closure, proposed, *May 6*, 1444–1446.
  War Taxes, Reasons for Continuing as a Permanent Charge, *May 1*, 935.

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
  Rt. Hon. Sir H. Fowler.

Chancellor of the Exchequer.
  Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith.

Channel Tunnel Bill
  c. 2R., *Apr. 25*, 345.
    Bill withdrawn, *Apr. 25*, 249.

Channing, Sir F. A. [Northants, E.]
  Agriculture Department Vice President—Inadvisability of Making Change in Present Tenure before Presenting of Report of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 24*, 147–149.

Chatham
  Barracks, Hospital, etc., Expenditure on.
    Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 296.
  Groyne at Hooness, Reason for abandoning Construction of.
    Os. Mr. A. Lee, *Apr. 25*, 344.

Cherry, Rt. Hon. R. R.—*Attorney-General for Ireland* [Liverpool, Exchange].
  Belfast, North—Allegations as to Irregularities in Parliamentary Election, *May 1*, 891.
  Court of Criminal Appeal Bill, Proposals for Extending to Ireland, *May 2*, 1072.
  Labourers Acts
    Administration of, Delay in Erecting Cottages, Reason for Increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1152–1154.
    Allotments under, Granting Powers to District Councils, proposed, *May 2*, 1152, 1153.
  Land Act, 1903—Effect of Section 54 on Borrowing Powers of Purchasers, *Apr. 25*, 243.
  Local Government Board
    Expenditure by, Increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1154.
    Inspectors, Temporary, Increase in Estimate for, *May 2*, 1154.

Chief Secretary for Ireland
  Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.

Children
  Poor Law, *see that title.*

Chiswick
  Council Chamber—Action of Police in Case of Councillor O'Brien.
    Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 2*, 1063.

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*Under-Secretary for the Colonies* [Manchester, N.W.]
  Africa, Central—Embargo on Native Labour Recruitment, *May 1*, 865.
  Africa, East
    Game Preservation, Measures taken for, *May 2*, 1039.
    Grogan Case
      Charge against Captain Grogan and Award of Compensation to Natives, *May 6*, 1333, 1334.
      Date of Summoning Captain Grogan, Authority for Issue of Summonses, etc., *Apr. 29*, 527, 528.
      Identity of, and Offices held by, Captain Grogan, *May 6*, 1333.
      Papers, Date of Tabling, *May 1*, 866.
    Kilindini Harbour, Proposals for Improving, *May 2*, 1039.
  Australia
    Commerce Act, Use of, to Place British Imports at a Disadvantage, Alleged, *Apr. 24*, 32.
    Naval and Military Defence, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 261.
  British Columbia Immigration Bill, Subject of, *May 1*, 866.
  Canadian Immigrants, Regulations as to Vaccination of, *May 1*, 867.
  Ceylon Coolie Children, Facilities for Education of, *Apr. 30*, 693; *May 2*, 1059.
  Colonial Conference 1907—Arrangements for Publishing Proceedings, *Apr. 25*, 261, 262.
  Deaf Mutes, Emigration of, to Colonies—Power of Colonial Governments to Prohibit Landing, *Apr. 24*, 31.
  Finance Act, 1894—Reason for Non-application of Section 20 to the Transvaal, *Apr. 29*, 503.
  Jamaica
    Swettenham, Sir A., Resignation of
      Correspondence, Information Contained in and Decision as to Publishing, *Apr. 30*, 689–692.
      Withdrawal, Opportunity given for, *Apr. 30*, 692.

[*cont.*

Churchill, Mr. W. L. S.—*cont.*

Natal

British Indian Traders—Inquiry into Refusal of Licences, proposed, *Apr. 30*, 693.

Dinizulu, Libel Action by—Information as to alleged Interference by Government, *May 4*, 1334.

Newfoundland Fisheries—Date of Tabling Papers, *May 1*, 866.

Orange River Colony—Position of British Settlers, *May 6*, 1344.

Rhodesia—Complaints Against Chartered Company, *Apr. 30*, 688.

St. Lucia Riots

Information as to—Measures taken to Restore Order, *Apr. 29*, 528, 529; *May 2*, 1055, 1056.

Transvaal

Chinese Labour

Repatriations, Expenditure on and Number effected, *May 6*, 1334, 1335.

Statistics as to Number Employed and Importation in 1907, *Apr. 30*, 692.

Unlicensed Coolies, Circumstances of Landing, *May 2*, 1057, 1058; *May 6*, 1338, 1342–1344.

Registration Bill, Provisions of, and Proposals as to, *May 2*, 1059.

Trinidad

Couva Riots, Information as to, *Apr. 30*, 689.

Import Duty on Swedish Matches, Effect of Reduction in, *Apr. 30*, 688.

Uganda—Game Preservation, Measures taken for, *May 2*, 1039.

Zanzibar Coast Strip, Abolition of Slavery on—Contents of Despatch of January, *Apr. 24*, 23, 31.

Civil Service

Irish Offices, Promotion and Salary, Increase in — Recommendations of Sir R. Holmes.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 30*, 712.

Retirement, Regulations as to Age for.
Q. Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 29*, 506, 507.

Second Division Clerks entering under Order of 21st March, 1890, Statistics as to.
Q. Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 29*, 507, 508.

Superannuation, *see that title.*

Civil Service Estimates

Class 3, Vote 14, Sub-head F., Supply of Details under, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 25*, 249.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 2*, 1050.

Ireland

Dublin Metropolitan Police, Salaries, etc.—£36,985, *Com., May 2*, 1087.

Local Government Board—£46,411, *Com., May 2*, 1139.

Office of Public Works, Salaries, etc.—£24,568, *Com., May 2*, 1113, 1138.

Clancy, Mr. J. Y. [Dublin County, N.]

Dublin County Grant—Amount deducted in Respect of Land Purchase Transactions, *May 6*, 1355.

Clare

Evicted Tenants—Reinstatements effected.
Q. Mr. Halpin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30*, 709.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 2*, 1072.

Clark, Mr. C. G. [Camberwell, Peckham]

Post Office Sick Leave and Pay Regulations, *May 2*, 1067.

Cleland, Mr. J. W. [Glasgow, Bridgeton]

Civil Service

Age for Retirement, *Apr. 29*, 506.

Second Division Clerks entering under Order of 21st March, 1890, Statistics as to, *Apr. 29*, 507.

Customs Department—Special Promotions since 1891, *May 6*, 1318.

Income Tax, Schedule E—Practice as to Servant of English Companies resident Abroad, *Apr. 26*, 381.

Licensing (Scotland) Act, 1903—Interpretation of Section 106, *May 6*, 1308.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 788–791.

Clifden

Pier Works, Cause of Delay in Commencing.
Q. Mr. O'Malley; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 2*, 1074.

Clogher

Courthouse, Reason for Refusal of use of, for Concert.
Q. Mr. T. W. Russell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 494.

Clooney

United Irish League Meeting, Reason for Prohibiting.
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 853.

Clough, Mr. W. [Yorks, W.R., Skipton]
Education (Administrative Provisions) and Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bills, Proposals as to, *May 2*, 1082.
Schools, Designation of, in New Official List, *Apr. 30*, 702, 703.

Cloveneden
Hibernian Band, Police Instructions as to Route to be taken by.
Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 491.

Coal
Export Duty on, Results of Abolition of.
Os. Mr. H. Beach, *Apr. 24*, 75.

Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill
Re-commitment, Proposals for—Precedent for Treatment of Bill, etc.
Qs. Captain Craig, Mr. D. A. Thomas, Mr. W. Abraham, Mr. W. E. Harvey, Mr. E. Cecil; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 25*, 271–274.

Coastguard
Cliff Ladders, Regulations as to Supply.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Apr. 29*, 535.
Inquiry
Action to be taken on Report.
Q. Major Seely; *A.* Mr. E.. Robertson, *Apr. 30*, 682.
Information as to.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 1*, 863.
Number of Men affected by closing of Stations.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr E. Robertson, *May 1*, 862, 863.
Stations closed, Disposal of Men from.
Qs. Mr. Hunt, Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 25*, 256.

Cochrane, Mr. T. H. [Ayrshire, N.]
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 624–626, 627, 628; *Apr. 30*, 716–723.

Cocoa
Duty on, Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. H. Beach, *Apr. 24*, 76.

Coffee
Legalised Vegetable Adulterants introduced in 1906.
Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 30*, 674.

Coinage and Currency
Gold Standard Reserve, Position and Extent of—Proportions held in England and India, etc.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 25*, 232, 233.

Collings, Rt. Hon. J. [Birmingham, Bordesley]
Fiscal Policy—British Capital drawn Abroad under present System, *Apr. 24*, 120–122.
Jamaica—Publication of Correspondence as to Resignation of Sir A. Swettenham, *Apr. 30*, 691.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 771–782.

Collins, Sir W. J. [St. Pancras, W.]
Japan—Qualifications of Medical Officer to Tokio British Embassy, *Apr. 30*, 671.
London Municipal Society—Subscription by London and North-Western Railway, *Apr. 25*, 369.
London and North-Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 369.
Women—Local Bodies, Proposals for Legislation to empower Service on, *Apr. 24*, 29.

Colmanstown
Smith, Mr., Outrage at House of.
Q. Sir B. Sheffield; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 880.

Colonial Conference, 1907
Preference Resolutions
Chancellor of the Exchequer, Figures given in Speech of and Responsibility for Publication.
Qs. Viscount Turnour, Mr. P. Pease; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Asquith, *May 6*, 1359.
Deakin, Mr. A., Speech of—Publication of Full Report, proposed,
Qs. Capt. Craig; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1358, 1359.
Publication and Tabling of Speeches, Proposals as to.
Qs. Viscount Turnour, Mr. A. Lee; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1358, 1359.
Proceedings, Arrangements for Publishing.
Qs. Mr. P. Pease, Mr. Lyttelton, Sir G. Parker, Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Sir H. Campbell - Bannerman, *Apr. 25*, 261–263.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 29*, 546.
Q. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Sir E. Sassoon; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 1*, 895, 896.
Q. Mr. Stanger; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1360.
Précis of Proceedings 15th to 26th April, Presented, *Apr. 30*, 631, 663,

Colonial Office
- *Secretary of State*—Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.
- *Parliamentary Secretary*—Mr. W. L. S. Churchill.

Colonial Shipping Conference
- *See under* Merchant Shipping.

Colonies and Protectorates
- (*For particular Colonies, etc., see their names*).
- British Capital invested in and Proposals for advancing Development of.
  - *Qs.* Sir H. Vincent, Mr. Wedgwood; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 2*, 1078, 1079.
- Parliamentary Systems—Inquiry into Reasons for Omission of Chamber of Hereditary and Spiritual Members, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. MacNeill; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 2*, 1080.

Committees
- Standing
  - Laxity of Attendance of Members, Allegations as to and Penalty for.
    - *Q.* Mr. C. Money; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 2*, 1079, 1080.
  - Notice given to Members to attend.
    - *Q.* Mr. W. Abraham; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 25*, 272.
  - Scottish Committee, Appointment of Members, *Apr. 25*, 291.
    - *Qs.* Sir H. Craik, Mr. Speaker, Sir B. Gurdon, *Apr. 30*, 714, 715.

Companies
- Limited
  - Compulsory Reserve Fund for Companies in Foreign Countries.
    - *Q.* Mr. Hyde; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 30*, 673.
  - Income-tax Liability of.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 25*, 270, 271.

Companies Bill
- *l. Com., May 2*, 996.
- Debate in Committee [Lords] *May 2*, 996.
  - Annual Statement of Assets and Liabilities, Penalty for Failure to File, 1011, 1012.
  - Auditors!
    - Appointment of New Auditor, Notice to be given to Shareholders, 1007–1009.
    - One] 'at |least to be a Professional Accountant, 1004–1006.

Companies Bill—*cont.*
- Debate in Committee—*cont.*
  - Australian Commonwealth declared to be a Colony within the Meaning of Companies (Colonial Registers) Act, 1883, 1028, 1029.
  - Balance Sheet to be signed by Directors of the Company, 1006, 1007.
  - Capital, Reorganisation of—Copy of Order sanctioning to be filed with Registrar, 1025.
  - Clause 6, Amendments to, 997, 998.
  - Government Amendments, 1001, 1002.
  - Investigation by Board of Trade, One-tenth of Shareholders to have Right of Applying for, 1029, 1030.
  - Issue of Shares at a Discount to be with Sanction of Special Resolution of the Company, 998–1001.
  - Meetings, Fourteen Days Notice to be given of, 1016–1018.
  - Mortgagee, Option of Purchase to be granted with Sanction of Extraordinary Resolution of the Company, proposed, 1002, 1003.
  - No Preference or Special Privilege belonging to any Class of Shares to be interfered with except by Special Resolution of the Company, 1024.
  - Order for Staying Dissolution of a Company, Copy to be filed with Registrar, 1021.
  - Penalty for non-filing of Copy of Prospectus, Increase of to £50, proposed, 996, 997.
  - Person acting as Director without the requisite Qualifications, Fine to be imposed on, 1022.
  - Poll, Facilities for on any Motion for Adjournment, proposed, 1018, 1019.
  - Private Companies
    - Conversion of into Public Company, Statement to be filed with Registrar, 1024.
    - Exemption from Operation of Clause 22 unless such Company has created a Mortgage or Charge, proposed, 1013–1015.
  - Receiver or Manager of Company on Ceasing to Act as such, to File Notice with the Registrar, 1025.
  - Refusal of Inspection of Register or Copy of Same, Fine of £5 for, 1003, 1004.
  - Scotland
    - Application of Act to—New Clause, 1031, 1032.

[*cont.*

Companies Bill—*cont.*
- Debates in Committee—*cont.*
  - Scotland—*cont.*
    - Bearer Bonds, Securing Validity of, in, 1023.
    - Companies Registered in, Summary to Specify Total Amount of Debt Due from Company in Respect of all Mortgages and Charges, 1010, 1011.

Companies (Winding-up) Act
- Accounts Presented, *Apr. 26*, 375; *Apr. 29*, 464.

Compulsory Weighing and Measurements Bill
- *c.* 2R. *May 3*, 1171.

Congested Districts Board (Scotland)
- Horse-Breeding Schemes—Inspection of Stallions.
  - *Q.* Mr. A. Cross; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 2*, 1044, 1045.
- Land Acquired by and New Holdings Formed, etc.
  - *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 2*, 1044.
- Report Presented, *May 6*, 1203, 1300.

Congo Free State
- Baptist Mission, Complaints by—Action proposed to be taken.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 6*, 1345, 1346.
- Correspondence Presented, *Apr. 24*, 6; *Apr. 25*, 178.

Constabulary, Royal Irish
- *See also Names of Places.*
- Cruise, District Inspector, Allegations as to Complaints Against.
  - *Q.* Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30*, 677.
- Inspectors and Head Constables, Number and Religion of.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 3*, 1170.

Cooper, Dr. G. [Southwark, Bermondsey]
- London
  - Ambulances for Street Accidents, Provision of Date of Issue of Committee Report, *Apr. 24*, 16.
  - Rates, Proposals for Equalisation of, *Apr. 29*, 533.
  - Paddington Borough Council Refusal to take Proceedings against Certain Local Traders, Reason for, etc., *Apr. 24*, 33.

Cooscreum
- Boat Slip, Decision as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 57.

Corbett, Mr. A. C. [Glasgow, Tradeston]
- Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26*, 418–420.
- Shop Hours Act, Failure of—Necessity for more Drastic Legislation with Regard to Closing of Shops and Hours of Shop Assistants, *May 1*, 973.

Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]
- Labourers Acts, Administration of—Delay in Erecting Cottages, Reason for Increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1161, 1162.
- Navy—Irish Visit of Atlantic Fleet, Arrangements for, *Apr. 24*, 30.
- Questions
  - Imputations in, Permissibility of, *May 1*, 880, 881.
  - Irish Matters asked on—Imputation in Speech of Chief Secretary at Halifax, *Apr. 29*, 544, 545.
- War Taxes, Reasons for Continuing as a Permanent Charge, *May 1*, 940.

Cork
- Grants, Deductions from.
  - *Qs.* Mr. McHugh; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30*, 665, 666, 706, 707.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30*, 669, 707, 708.
- Land Purchase Inspectors Employed in.
  - *Q.* Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 47.

Cornwall, Duchy of
- *Lord Warden*—Earl of Ducie.

Coroners' Inquests
- Suicides, Letters Written by, Desirability of not giving Publicity to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *Apr. 25*, 282.

Cotton, Sir H. J. S. [Nottingham, E.]
- India
  - Bhagalpur District Magistrate—Alleged Improper Use of Influence with Indian Gentlemen, *Apr. 30*, 686.
  - Punjaub—Information as to Rawalpindi Disturbances, *May 6*, 1331.
- Opium, Indian—Placing Reports of Benares and Behar Opium Agents in Library, proposed, *May 1*, 860.

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill
- Ireland, Proposals for Extension to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *May 2*, 1072.
- Second Reading, Date of Taking.
  - *Q.* Mr. Billson; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 29*, 545.

Courthope, Mr. G. L. [Sussex, Rye]
- Army
  - Bullets, Small-Bore, Result of Inquiry into, *Apr. 24*, 17.
  - Lee-Enfield Rifles, Proposals for Conversion of, *Apr. 24*, 18.
- Ballingarry Postmistress, Refusal of Letters Addressed to, and Circumstances of Assault on Gortnahoctee Postman, *Apr. 30*, 713.
- Bexhill War Office Land, Sale of, *Apr. 24*, 19.
- Blacklion—Boycott of Mr. Taylor, Cause of, *Apr. 24*, 45.
- Business Committee, Establishment of, proposed, *May 6*, 1414.
- Estate Duty—Deductions under Section 21 of Finance Act of 1896, *May 1*, 947, 948.
- Tea Duty, Reduction of, to Fourpence per Pound, proposed, *May 1*, 905.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill
  - Allocation of Time to Various Stages, Proposals as to, *May 6*, 1413–1415.

Courtney, Lord
- Municipal Representation Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 632–644, 656.

Cox, Mr. H. [Preston]
- Africa South
  - Constabulary, Strength of, and Purpose of Maintenance, *Apr. 29*, 520.
  - Garrison—Strength, Cost, and Purpose of Maintaining, *Apr. 29*, 521.
- Army Pensions, Period for Payment of, *Apr. 29*, 516.
- Australian Military and Naval Defence, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 261.
- Free Labour Association, London and North-Western Railway, Allegations as to Payment made by, *Apr. 25*, 358.
- Indian Railway Rolling Stock, Increase of, *Apr. 29*, 509.
- London and North-Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 358–360.
- Old-Age Pensions
  - Poor Relief and Friendly Societies, Effect of Colonial and German Schemes on, *Apr. 25*, 269.
  - Supply of Intoxicants to Pensioners, Proposals for Penalty on, *Apr. 25*, 269.
- Railway Subscriptions to Party Organisations, Prohibition of—Legislative Proposals, *Apr. 25*, 358.
- Rights of Way, Proposals for Preservation, *Apr. 29*, 546.
- United States—Pensions Paid by Government, *Apr. 25*, 236.

Craig, Captain J. [Down, E.]
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill—Proposals for Recommitment, *Apr. 25*, 271.
- Colonial Conference Preference Resolutions—Publication of Speech of Mr. A. Deakin, *May 6*, 1358.
- Hague Conference Disarmament Proposals—Effect of German Attitude on British Expenditure on Armaments, *May 6*, 1356.
- Irish Council Bill—Time Allotted to First Reading Debate, *May 6*, 1361.
- Irish Language, Proposals for Teaching in Schools, *May 1*, 885.
- Land Purchase
  - Funds
    - Amount lying in Banks without Interest, *Apr. 24*, 66.
    - Condition of, and Balance remaining in Hand, *Apr. 24*, 56, 57.
  - Proceedings, Expediting of, proposed, *May 1*, 876.
- National Debt—Permanent Annual Charge for Reduction of Debt, *May 1*, 950, 951.
- Tea Duty, Reduction of, to Fourpence per Pound, proposed, *May 1*, 912, 913.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Financial Resolution, Exemption of from Closure, proposed, *May 6*, 1423, 1440.
- Transvaal Chinese Labour— Repatriations Effected, *May 6*, 1335.

Craig, Mr. C. C. [Antrim, S.]
- Condition of Ireland—Statements in Appeal by Lord Ashtown, *May 2*, 1077.
- Labourers' Acts
  - Administration of, Delay in Erecting Cottages, Reason for Increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1156.
  - Cottages—Circumstances under which Erection is Sanctioned, *Apr. 29*, 500.
  - Funds, Effect on, of Deficiencies Occasioned by Land Purchase Finance, *May 2*, 1077.
- Oranmore—Disturbance at House of P. Burke, *May 2*, 1075.
- War Taxes, Reasons for continuing as a Permanent Charge, *May 1*, 940.

Craik, Sir H. [Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities]
- Committee, Standing Scottish—Wording of Notification as to Appointment of Members, *Apr. 30*, 714.
- Labourers Acts, Administration of, Delay in erecting Cottages, Reason for Increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1162, 1163.
- Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26*, 443–446.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 594–599.

Crannagh Farm
  Clooney Sacred Society, Alleged Threatening Letter received from.
    Q. Viscount Turnour; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 879, 880.
  Tenants, Present Position of.
    Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 59.

Crean, Mr. E. [Cork, S.E.]
  Barry Estate, Sale of—Position of Cooldorihy Tenants, *May 1*, 882.
  Lisevine—Reinstatement Claim of J. Barry, *May 1*, 881.
  Low Estate, Sale Proposals for, *May 1*, 872.

Crewe, Earl of—*Lord President of the Council*
  Dental Companies (Restriction of Practice) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 470.
  House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1223–1237, 1242, 1279.
  Prohibition of Medical Practice by Companies Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 468, 469.
  Small Holdings
    Crown Lands, Experiments made with, *Apr. 25*, 216.
    Report and Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 25*, 215.
    Speech made by Prime Minister at Holborn Restaurant, Terms of, *Apr. 25*, 214, 215.
  Training Colleges, Hostels in Connection with—Regulations as to Grants-in-Aid for, *Apr. 25*, 224–227.

Criminal Procedure
  Charges against Absent Persons not Parties to Proceedings, Desirability of preventing Publication of.
    Qs. Mr. Bottomley; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *Apr. 25*, 281, 282.
  Conditional Licences Granted, *see under title* Penal Servitude Acts.

Crofters Commission
  See under Scotland.

Crombie, Mr. J. W. [Kincardineshire]
  Intestate Husband's Estate (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1185.

Crooks, Mr. W. [Woolwich]
  Transvaal Chinese Labour—Circumstances of landing of Unlicensed Coolies, *May 2*, 1058.
  Woolwich Arsenal Discharges—Number projected, *Apr. 29*, 525, 526.

Cross, Mr. A. [Glasgow, Camlachie]
  Congested Districts Board Horse Breeding Schemes—Inspection of Stallions, *May 2*, 1044.
  Rosyth, Price paid for and Date of Commencement of Definite Proposals for utilising as Naval Base, *May 2*, 1054.

Cross, Mr. A.—*cont.*
  Spirit Duty, Incidence of, *May 1*, 945.
  Tea Duty, Reduction of, to 4d. per Pound, proposed, *May 1*, 913–915.
  War Taxes, Reasons for Continuing as a Permanent Charge, *May 1*, 937.

Crouch End
  Telephone Exchange, Date of Opening.
    Q. Captain Balfour; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 2*, 1038.

Crown Lands
  Agency, Reason for Changes in.
    Q. Mr. H. H. Marks; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 24*, 40, 41.

Cuba
  Porto Rico—Trade Report Presented, *Apr. 29*, 463.

Customs and Excise
  Amendment of Law relating to Customs—Resolution Reported, *May 1*, 904.
  Promotion, Special, in Customs Department since 1891.
    Q. Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 6*, 1318.
  Statistical Department Clerks
    Appointment and Promotion of.
      Q. Mr. Seaverns; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 1*, 858.
    Reply to Memorial from.
      Q. Sir W. Bull; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 24*, 25.
  Watchers, Overtime Payment of.
    Q. Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 25*, 247, 248.

Dairies, &c.
  Scotland, Inspections in and Local Authorities approving Employment of Veterinary Surgeons.
    Qs. Mr. Watt; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 30*, 708, 709.

Davies, Mr. T. [Fulham]
  London Combined Drainage, Cost of Maintaining—Amendment of Law, proposed, *Apr. 30*, 700.
  Shop Hours Act, Failure of—Necessity for more Drastic Legislation with regard to Closing of Shops and Hours of Shop Assistants, *May 1*, 974.

De Montalt Estate
  Untenanted Lands, Purchase and Disposal of.
    Q. Mr. P. White; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6*, 1323.

Deaf Mutes
  Emigration to Colonies—Power of Colonial Governments to prohibit landing.
    Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 24*, 31.

Death Duties
  Estate Duty
    Deductions under Section 21 of Finance Act of 1896.
      Os. Mr. Courthope, Mr. Asquith, *May 1*, 947, 948.
    Resolution Reported, *May 1*, 903.
    Valuations, Persons qualified to make, *Q.* Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 2*, 1049.
  New Scale
    Resolution [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 24*, 134; Reported, *May 1*, 957.
  Revenue from, Increase in for 1906–7. *Os.* Mr. Bowles, *Apr. 24*, 106.
  Revision of, Proposals as to. *Os.* Mr. H. Beach, *Apr. 24*, 74; Mr. S. T. Evans, 89; Mr. C. Money, 118.

Defence of the Empire
  Dissemination of News in Time of War, Government Control over, etc.
    Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Apr. 29*, 479; Lord Tweedmouth, 480–482; Earl Cawdor, 482.
  Mediterranean Defences Committee—Names of Members.
    Q. Mr. Beach; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 2*, 1083.

Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's County, Ossory]
  Agriculture Department Salaries—Postponement of Applications for Increase, proposed, *May 2*, 1073.
  Ancient Monuments, Preservation of—Criticisms on Policy of Board of Works, *May 2*, 1116.
  Arterial Drainage, Failure of Board of Works to deal with, *May 2*, 1115.
  Barrow River Drainage Scheme, Date of proceeding with, *May 2*, 1116.
  Caldbeck Estate—Cause for Delay in Sale, *May 6*, 1321.
  Civil Service—Promotion and Salaries in Irish Offices, *Apr. 30*, 712.
  Dublin
    Phœnix Park—Regulations as to Grounds allotted to Football Clubs, *May 2*, 1118.
    Post Office, Proposals for Re-building, *Apr. 25*, 243.
    Treasury Remembrancers' Office—Salary and Appointments of Mr. J. T. Drennan, *Apr. 29*, 542.
  Government Departments, Saturday Half-holiday for, proposed, *May 6*, 1317.
  Piers and Harbours, Development of, Failure of Board of Works to deal with *May 2*, 1114, 1115.
  School Buildings Plans, Delay in Sanctioning, *May 2*, 1116.

Delany, Mr. W.—*cont.*
  Treasury, Secretary to—Date of taking Vote for Salary, *Apr. 25*, 289.
  Works Board
    Constitution of—Qualifications and Salaries of Members, *May 2*, 1114.
    Religious Opinions of Staff—Treatment of Roman Catholics, *May 2*, 1117–1119, 1132.
    Staff—Information as to Certain Officers, *May 6*, 1354.
    Statements made by Employees to Members, or to the Press, Penalties for, *May 2*, 1118.

Delmege Estate
  Sale Proposals for.
    Qs. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 514; *May 6*, 1302.

Denbigh, Earl of
  Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 474, 478.

Denmark
  Taxation System—Report Presented, *Apr. 25*, 178.

Dental Companies (Restriction of Practice) Bill
  l. 2R., *Apr. 29*, 470.

Dernakesh
  Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed. *Q.* Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 25*, 244.

Destructive Insects and Pests Bill
  l. 2R., *Apr. 29*, 471.
    Com. and Rep. Apr. 30*, 631.

Devlin, Mr. J. [Belfast, W.]
  Belfast
    Factories, etc.
      Female Inspector, Provision of, *Apr. 25*, 287; *May 1*, 868.
      Number of Employees in, *Apr. 25*, 286.
    Parliamentary Election for Northern Division, Allegations as to Irregularities in, *May 1*, 891.
    Police Force—Promotion Claim of Sergeant Kerrigan, *Apr. 25*, 254.
  Cloveneden Hibernian Band, Police Instructions as to Route to be taken by, *Apr. 29*, 491.
  Ulster Magistrates, Number and Religion of, *May 6*, 1312.

Devonport Corporation Bill
  c. 2R.* *Apr. 29*, 488.

Dewar, Mr. A. [Edinburgh, S.]
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 781–786.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir C. W. [Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean]
- Army
  - Cavalry Men, Cause for Increase of Military Offences among, *May 6*, 1306.
  - Second Line—Camp Pay and Allowance, *Apr. 30*, 684.
- Indian Army—Strength and Expenditure in 1900, 1901, 1902, and 1906–7, *Apr. 30*, 672.
- Militia Reserve, Proposals as to, under New Scheme, *May 6*, 1306.
- Navy
  - Dockyards, Policy with regard to, Criticism of, *Apr. 25*, 323, 324.
  - Rosyth, Policy as to, *Apr. 25*, 323, 324.
  - Submarine Mines, Abolition of, Proposals as to Sale of Plant, etc., *Apr. 25*, 341.
- Shop Hours Act, Failure of—Necessity for more drastic Legislation with regard to Closing of Shops and Hours of Shop Assistants, *May 1*, 972.
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill
  - Amendments, Effect of Guillotine Resolution on, *May 6*, 1380–1382.
  - County Association Funds, Expenditure of, *May 2*, 1054; *May 6*, 1306.
  - Increased Estimate, Measures proposed for Showing, *May 6*, 1307.
- Zanzibar—Slavery in Coast Strip, Abolition of, Contents of Despatch of January, *Apr. 24*, 23.

Dillon, Mr. J. [Mayo, E.]
- Agriculture Department Vice-Presidency—Reasons for retention of Sir H. Plunkett, *Apr. 24*, 149–154.
- Labourers Acts, Administration of, Delay in erecting Cottages, Reason for increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1155.
- School Building Plans, Decision as to, *May* 1, 878.
- Taxation of Ireland—Incidence of Direct and Indirect Taxation, *May 1*, 916–918.
- Tea Duty, Reduction of, to 4d. per pound, proposed, *May 1*, 916.

Dockyards, Naval
- *See under* Navy.

Dolan, Mr. [Leitrim, N.]
- Agriculture—Area under Cultivation in certain Foreign Countries, *Apr. 25*, 247; *Apr. 29*, 504.
- Evans Estate—Lodging of Request under Section 40 of Act, *Apr. 26*, 385.
- Gublaun Police Duties in preserving Peace, Latest Occasion of Exercising, *Apr. 25*, 233.
- Kiltyclogher—Reinstatement Claim of W. McGowan, *May 2*, 1051.

Dolan, Mr.—*cont.*
- Tottenham Estate—Case of Mrs. Dolan, *Apr. 24*, 22.
- Wynne Estate—Case of P. Sweeney, *Apr. 26*, 384.

Donelan, Captain A. J. C. [Cork, E.]
- Agriculture Department, Work of, *Apr. 30*, 705, 706.
- Questions containing Imputations, Permissibility of, *May 1*, 880, 881.
- Sarsfield Estate—Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, Proposals for, *Apr. 24*, 61.

Doughty, Sir G. [Great Grimsby]
- Moray Firth, Trawling in—Reason for Prosecuting British Subjects in Subordinate Positions in Foreign Vessels, *Apr. 30*, 682.

Dover
- Harbour Works, Expenditure on.
  - *Os.* Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 296; Mr. Mond, 313; Mr Ashley, 316.

Downpatrick
- Rural District Council—Resolution as to, Prohibition of display of Old Clothes from Belfast, for sale on Fair Days.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 255.

Dowra
- Disturbance of 19th February—Reason for discharge of Accused Persons.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Meysey-Thompson; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 62.

Dublin
- County Grant, Amount deducted from in respect of Land Purchase Transactions.
  - *Q.* Mr. Clancy; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 6*, 1355.
- Metropolitan Police
  - Cox, Sergeant, Conduct of, in Licensing Prosecution.
    - *Q.* Mr. P. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 22.
  - Criminal Charges manufactured by,—Alleged.
    - *Os.* Mr. P. White, *May 2*, 1091–1093; Mr. Nannetti, 1095; Mr. Birrell, 1107, 1108; Mr. Kettle, 1113.
  - Duties, Extension of, proposed.
    - *Os.* Mr. McKean, *May 2*, 1098–1102.
  - Numerical Strength in Excess of Requirements, Alleged.
    - *Os.* Mr. P. White, *May 2*, 1090, 1091, 1094; Mr. W. Redmond, 1105; Mr. Birrell, 1107, 1108, 1109.
  - Rates levied for Upkeep, Exorbitant nature of, Alleged.
    - *Os.* Mr. P. White, *May 2*, 1088–1090; Mr. Nannetti, 1095–1098; Mr. W. Redmond, 1102–1106; Mr. Birrell, 1106–1109; Mr. Kettle, 1109–1113.

[*cont.*

Dublin—*cont.*
  Metropolitan Police—*cont.*
    Reason for comparative Paucity of Protestants.
      Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 21.
    Salaries and Allowances of.
      Os. Mr. Kettle, *May 2*, 1112.
    Vote for, *May 2*, 1087.
  Parks, Rate of Wages paid to Men employed in.
    Os. Mr. Nannetti, *May 2*, 1138; Mr. Runciman, 1139.
  Phœnix Park—Grounds allotted to Football Clubs, Regulations as to.
    Os. Mr. Delany, *May 2*, 1118; Mr. Runciman, 1128.
  Post Office, Re-building, Proposals for.
    Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 25*, 243.
  Treasury Remembrancer's Office—Salary and Appointments of Mr. J. T. Drennan.
    Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 29*, 542.
  Valuation Office, Promotion System in.
    Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 26*, 379, 381.

Duffy, Mr. W. J. [Galway, S.]
  Kinvara Harbour Works, Progress made with, *May 2*, 1138.
  Lambert Minors Estate, Sale Proposals for, *May 2*, 1073.
  Works Board Loans, Refusal of Applications for, *May 2*, 1137.

Duke of York's School
  Accommodation at Dover—Reason for not providing the same as at Chelsea.
    Q. Mr. Horniman; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 30*, 680.

Dumbarton
  Church Property Trust, Disposal of.
    Q. Mr. Remnant; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 6*, 1317.
  Sewage Works—Proposals as to Inquiry.
    Qs. Mr. R. Duncan; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 2*, 1071, 1072.

Duncan, Mr. C. [Barrow-in-Furness]
  "Hyson," ss.—Cause of Fatal Accident to Meakin, and Proposals for preventing similar Accidents, *Apr. 24*, 28.
  Liverpool Dock Regulations, Breaches of by certain Ships, *Apr. 25*, 242.

Duncan, Mr. R. [Lanark, Govan]
  Dumbarton
    Sewage Works—Proposals as to Inquiry, *May 2*, 1071, 1072.
  Old Age Pensions—Effect of Colonial and German Schemes on Poor Relief and Friendly Societies, *Apr. 25*, 269.
  Parliamentary Session, Alteration in Period for, proposed, *May 2*, 1084.

Dunnet Bay
  Illegal Trawling in—Date of last Visit of Cruiser.
    Q. Mr. R. L. Harmsworth; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 1*, 869, 870.

Dunraven, Earl of
  House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1281–1290.

Easington
  Poor Law Guardians, Co-option of Member by.
    Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *May 2*, 1065.

Ecclesiastical Disorders
  Failure of Episcopal Authorities to deal with—Withdrawal of Letters of Business in order to compel Enforcement of Law proposed.
    Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 29*, 497.

Edalji Case
  Inquiry—Date of Presenting Report.
    Q. Sir G. Parker; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 25*, 274.

Edenderry
  Poor Law Guardians—Circumstances of accepting Tenders for Drugs.
    Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 54, 55.

Edinburgh
  Grassmarket, Legality of holding Cattle Market in.
    Q. Mr. Gulland; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 6*, 1310.

Education Act, 1870
  Section 16, Repeal of—Effect on Powers of the Board as to Infringements of Cowper Temple Clause.
    Q. Mr. A. Hutton; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 30*, 704.

Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill
  Clause 10—Expert Opinion on which Drafted.
    Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 6*, 1310.
  Proposals as to
    Qs. Mr. Clough; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 2*, 1082.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 1) Bill
  l. 2R.* *May 1*, 821.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London, No. 2) Bill
  l. 1R.* *Apr. 29*, 462.

Education, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. S. Lough.

Education (England and Wales)
[*For particular Places, see their Names.*]
Agriculture Instruction, *see under title* Agriculture.
Harrow School, Cost of Upkeep of
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 29*, 506.
Schools
Designation of, in New Official List.
Qs. Mr. Clough; *As.* Mr. McKenna, Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 30*, 702, 703.
Expenditure of Public Money on erecting—Legislative Proposals.
Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 6*, 1309, 1310.
Secondary Education Endowments—Publication of Information in Possession of the Board.
Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 29*, 535.
Teachers—Number sent Abroad to Train in Foreign Languages.
Q. Mr. Maclean; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 30*, 701.
Training Colleges, Hostels in connection with—Regulations as to Grants-in-Aid for.
Os. Lord Monk Bretton, *Apr. 25*, 222–224; Earl of Crewe, 224–227.
Welsh Department—Financial Proposals in connection with.
Os. Mr. V. Cavendish, *Apr. 24*, 94.

Education (Ireland)
[*For particular Places, see their Names.*]
Commissioners' Report (1906), Presented, *May 6*, 1203, 1300.
Expenditure, Information as to.
Q. Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 23.
Inspectors
Appeals against and Application for reinspection.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6*, 1322.
Transfer, Regulations for and Allegations as to unfavourable First Reports made.
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 8, 9.
Intermediate
Grants Paid and Number of Students passing (1900–6), Information as to.
Qs. Mr. Kettle; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 848–50, 889.

Education (Ireland)—*cont.*
Intermediate—*cont.*
Inspection System, Decision as to.
Q. Mr. Gwynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 886.
Parliamentary Discussion, Facilities for.
Qs. Mr. Kettle, Mr. J. Redmond; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 2*, 1081, 1082.
National School Teachers
Daily Report Book, Personal Details inserted in.
Q. Mr. Moore; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 26*, 385, 386.
Pension Fund—Accounts (1906) Presented, *May 6*, 1203, 1301.
Salaries, Incidence of Paying.
Q. Mr. H. Law; *A*; Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 855, 856.
School Buildings Plans and Grants, Delay in Settlement of Question.
Os. Mr. Delany, *May 2*, 1116; Sir T. Esmonde, 1125; Mr. Runciman, 1128.
Q. Mr. Dillon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 878.
Secondary System, Necessity for Improving.
Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 887.

Education (Scotland)
Vice-President of the Council—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
[*For particular Places, see their Names.*]
Committee of Privy Council—Publication of Names of Ministers and Dates of Meetings proposed.
Qs. Mr. Morton, Mr. Smeaton; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 25*, 290.
Continuation Classes and Central Institutions—Reports, etc. (1905–6), Presented, *May 6*, 1202, 1300.

Education (Special Religious Instruction) Bill
Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Clough; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 2*, 1082.

Edwards, Mr. A. C. [Denbigh District]
Free Labour Association, Payments made to, by London and North Western Railway, *Apr. 25*, 353.
London and North Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 352–354.

Egypt
Administration—Cause for Dismissal of Officials.
Qs. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 266.
Assouan Dam, raising of—Allocation of Contract.
Qs. Mr. Bowles; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 30*, 693, 694.

[*cont.*

Egypt—*cont.*
- Children, Destitute, Provision of Homes for, proposed.
  - *Q.* Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 2*, 1060.
- Civil Service
  - Board for Seletcion of Candidates, Information as to.
    - *Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 267, 268.
  - Syrians in.
    - *Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 267.
- Date Tax, Abolition of, proposed.
  - *Qs.* Mr. J. M. Robertson, Mr. Ashley. *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 30*, 695.
- Denshawai Village, Law authorising Penalty inflicted on.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 30*, 694.
- Destitution in.
  - *Q.* Sir G. Parker; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 2*, 1061.
- Factories and Mines, Introduction of Legislation to deal with, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 30*, 695, 696.
- General Assembly, Proposals of—Despatch Presented, *Apr. 24*, 6; *Apr. 25*, 178.
- Press, Proposals for restricting Freedom of.
  - *Q.* Mr. Fell; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 268, 269.
- Sanitation, Improvement of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 2*, 1060.
- Unrest in—Connection with Lahore Disturbance,
  - *Q.* Captain Faber; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 1*, 861.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *Apr. 30*, 630.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *Apr. 30*, 630.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *Apr. 30*, 630,

Electric Supply Corporation Bill
- *l.* 2R.* *Apr. 25*, 177.

Eleven o'Clock Rule
- Suspension of Motion (Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman), *May 6*, 1364.

Ellenborough, Lord
- Dissemination of News in Time of War, Government Control over, etc., *Apr. 29*, 479.

Ellenborough Lord—*cont.*
- Navy
  - Docking Accommodation for large Vessels of "Dreadnought" Type, etc., *May 1*, 838.
  - Rosyth, Policy as to, *May 1*, 837, 838.

Ellis, Mr. J. E. [Nottingham, Rushcliffe]
- Indian Budget, Date of taking, *May 2*, 1055.

Elphin
- Disturbance on 14th April—Measures taken for Preservation of Peace, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, *May 1*, 873, 874.

Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
- Worthing Gas Bill, *Con.*, *Apr. 29*, 612–614.

Empire Day
- Official Recognition of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Viscount Turnour; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 25*, 288.

Employment of Women Bill
- *l.* 1R.* *May 6*, 1298.

Erskine, Mr. D. C. [Perthshire, W.]
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 742–746.

Esmonde, Sir T. G. [Wexford, N.]
- Ancient Monuments, Preservation of—Criticisms on Policy of Board of Works, *May 2*, 1124.
- Arklow Harbour Works, Progress made with, *May 2*, 1126.
- Arterial Drainage, Failure of Board of Works to deal with, *May 2*, 1124.
- Bank of England—Payment of Interest on Irish Government Deposits, proposed, *May 6*, 1319.
- Bank of Ireland
  - Act constituting as Government Banker, *May 6*, 1317.
  - Balances to Credit of Government in, Disposal of Interest on, *Apr. 30*, 711.
- Calendar of Justiciary Rolls, Proposals for Publishing, *Apr. 30*, 678.
- Greystones Harbour Works, Proposals as to, *May 2*, 1126.
- Land Purchase Moneys, Bank authorised to receive, *Apr. 30*, 675.
- Marine Works Act, Expenditure under, *May 2*, 1125, 1126.
- Ordnance Maps—Designation of Catholic Places of Worship, *Apr. 30*, 675.
- Piers and Harbours, Development of, Failure of Board of Works to deal with, *May 2*, 1125, 1126.
- Public Trustee Act—Extension to Ireland proposed, *Apr. 30*, 680.
- School Buildings Plans, Delay in sanctioning, *May 3*, 1125.

[*cont.*

Esmonde, Sir T. G.—*cont.*
Wexford Grant, Deductions from, in respect of Land Purchase, *Apr. 30*, 679.
Works Board
  Inspectors, Original, Betterment of Pensions of, proposed, *May 2*. 1125.
  Loans, Facilities for granting Smaller Loans, proposed, *May 2*, 1124.

Estate Duty
See under Death Duties.

Estimates
See also Titles Army Estimates, Civil Service Estimates, *and* Navy Estimates.

Evans Estate
Section 40 of Act, Lodging of Request under.
  Q. Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 26*, 385.

Evans, Mr. S. T. [Glamorganshire, Mid.]
Business Committee, Establishment of, proposed, *May 6*, 1412.
Death Duties, Revision of, Proposals as to, *Apr. 24*, 89.
Income Tax
  Earned Incomes up to £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 86, 87.
  Graduation—Report and Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 24*, 85, 87, 88.
  Returns, Employers to give Particulars of all Salaries paid, *Apr. 24*, 88.
Old-Age Pensions—Government Proposals, *Apr. 24*, 84, 89.
Parliamentary Session, Alteration in Period for, proposed, *May 2*, 1083, 1084.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill, Allocation of Time to various Stages, Proposals as to, *May 6*, 1412, 1413.

Evans-Gordon, Major Sir W. [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]
Aliens, Exclusion and Deportation of Undesirables, Necessity for—Presentment of Grand Jury of Central Criminal Court, *Apr. 29*, 530.

Evictions
See under Ireland

Exchequer and Audit Department
Political Influence, Use of, to advance Promotion, etc.—Reason for Issue of Order.
  Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 24*, 25.

Exports and Imports
Arms and Ammunition imported in 1905—Amount of Naval and Military Stores, etc.
  Q. Mr. Mond; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 24*, 34.
Classification of Raw Materials and Manufactured Articles in Returns, System of.
  Qs. Mr. Mond, Mr. Myer; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, *Apr. 24*, 34, 35.
Colonies and India, Statistics as to Trade with, during 1906.
  Q. Mr. J. D. White; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 30*, 674.
Prices of 1900, Return based on—Reason for choice of Year.
  Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 25*, 244, 245.
Relative Average Prices in 1900 and 1906.
  Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George *Apr. 25*, 245.
Return as to Value of Exports, Imports, and Re-exports (1904–6), Ordered, *Apr. 29*, 490.

Faber, Captain W. V. [Hants, Andover]
Bishopstoke Church, Consecration of, *May 6*, 1316.
Bulford Camp—Accommodation for Married Establishment of Scots Greys, *May 1*, 864.
Egypt, Unrest in—Connection with Lahore Disturbance, *May 1*, 861.
India—Information as to Rawalpindi Disturbances, *May 6*, 1332.
Naval Dockyards, Staff employed in—Comparison with 1905, *May 1*, 863.
Portsmouth, Earl of—Allegations as to harsh Treatment of Tenant, *May 1*, 895; *May 6*, 1361.

Faber, Lord
Companies Bill, *Com.*, *May 2*, 1000, 1005, 1008, 1013, 1017, 1018.

Faber, Mr. G. D. [York]
"Mikado," Withdrawal of Licence from and Prohibition of Performance by Naval and Marine Bands, *May 6*, 1324, 1347.

Factories and Workshops
Inspectors, Assistant, Duties of.
  Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 29*, 532.
Young Persons, Employment of—Measures taken to give Publicity to Order No. 680.
  Q. Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 29*, 531, 532.

Factory and Workshop Bill
l. 1R.* *May 2*, 995.

Falmouth Gas Bill
- *l. Rep.* Apr. 30,* 629.

Fardell, Sir T. G. [Paddington, S.]
- Kensington Gardens—Proposals for Removal of Forcing Frames, etc., *Apr. 29,* 505.

Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
- Gargrie—Labourer's Cottage Application of J. Reilly, *May 1,* 883.
- Longford County Council Grant, Deduction from, *May 1,* 884.
- Maconchy Estate Turbary Trustee—Reason for Removal of Mr. M. Kiernan, *May 1,* 884.
- Mullaghavourneen—Reason for Detention of Receivable Order of P. Casey, *May 6,* 1314.
- Navy Pensions—Case of J. Mullen, *May 1,* 858.
- Soldiers' Families, Rule compelling Support of—Case of T. Sonden, *May 1,* 860.
- Springtown—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. A. Smyth, *May 1,* 883.
- Swine, Irish—Protests against Restrictions on Importation into England, *May 1,* 884.

Fay Estates
- Application of Section 40 of Land Act, 1896.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sheehy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 52, 53.

Feeble-minded Persons
- Commission Report, Date of Presenting.
  - *Q.* Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 29,* 545, 546.

Fell, Mr. A. [Great Yarmouth]
- Aliens, Employment in East End and consequent Exclusion of English Labour, *Apr. 29,* 534.
- Calcutta Memorial to Queen Victoria, Date of completing, *Apr. 29,* 500.
- Egyptian Press, Proposals for restricting Freedom of, *Apr. 25,* 268.
- Income-Tax—Liability of Limited Companies, *Apr. 25,* 270, 271.
- Militia Garrison Artillery—Ammunition to be Issued for Training, *Apr. 25,* 235; *Apr. 29,* 523; *May 2,* 1054.
- Salonica—Circumstances of Capture of Mr. Abbott by Brigands, *May 2,* 1061, 1062.
- Woolwich Arsenal Discharged Workmen—Offers of Employment in Germany, *May 2,* 1064, 1065.

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. M. [Leith Burghs]
- Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26,* 415–418.
- Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29,* 547–559.

Fetherstonhaugh, Mr. G. [Fermanagh, N.]
- Land Act, 1903—Effect of Section 54 on Borrowing Powers of Purchasers, *Apr. 25,* 242.
- Land Purchase
  - Act of 1891—Proposals for making Rules under Section 2, *Apr. 26,* 375.
  - Guaranteed Stock, Facilities for Purchase through Post Office, *Apr. 24,* 28.
- Liquor Traffic—Proposals for Legislation, *Apr. 25,* 255.

Ffrench Estate
- Purchase Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 49.

Ffrench, Mr. P. [Wexford, S.]
- Wexford—Land Purchase Expediting Proceedings proposed, *Apr. 24,* 51.

Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
- Exchequer and Audit Department—Use of Political Influence to Advance Promotion, etc., Reason for Issue of Order, *Apr. 24,* 25.
- Gambling in Shares, Protection of bonâ-fide Investors from, proposed, *Apr. 29,* 516.
- Land Commission—Clerks, Classification, Salaries and Duties of, *May 1,* 851, 852.
- Post Office Stores in Ireland—Position of Staff under New Arrangement, *May 6,* 1316.
- Votes, Irish Unexpended, Amounts Saved on since 1903—Allocation of Money, *May 2,* 1040.

Finance Act, 1894
- Section 20, Reason for Non-application of, to the Transvaal.
  - *Q.* Col. Lockwood; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 29,* 503.

Findlay, Mr. A. [Lanark, N.E.]
- Motherwell—Cross Keys Public-house, Holder of Certificate for, *May 2,* 1047.

First Commissioner of Works
- *Rt. Hon. L. Harcourt.*

First Lord of the Admiralty
- *Lord Tweedmouth.*

First Lord of the Treasury
- *Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.*

Fiscal Policy
- British Capital Driven Abroad under Present System.
  - *Os.* Mr. J. Collings, *Apr. 24,* 120–122; Mr. Hunt, 127–129.

Fisheries, Ireland
Cured Fish, Brand for—Date of Publishing Evidence.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 57, 58.
Legislative Proposals for Amendment of Law.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29,* 511.
Salmon Fisheries, *see that title.*

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]
Irish Lights Board, Luncheon Allowance of, *Apr. 24,* 38.

Fletcher, Mr. J. S. [Hampstead]
Tea Duty, Reduction of, to 4d. per pound, proposed, *May 1,* 904.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]
Barry Estate, Sale Proposals for and Price asked, *Apr. 24,* 44.
Cork Grants, Deductions from, in Respect of Land Purchase, *Apr. 30,* 669, 707, 708.
Cruise, District Constabulary Inspector, Allegations as to Complaints against, *Apr. 30,* 677.
Evictions—Delay Caused in Reinstatements by Removal of Inspectors, *May 1,* 876, 877.
Longfield Estate—Case of D. Lehane, *Apr. 25,* 253.
Land Purchase Inspectors, System of Employing—Number Working in County Cork, *Apr. 24,* 47.
Rock Chapel Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *May 2,* 1037.

Folkestone, Sandgate and Hythe Tramways Bill
c. Rep. Apr. 25,* 228.

Foreign Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.
Under-Secretary—Lord Fitzmaurice.
Messengers Appointed in 1906-7.
Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 29,* 529.

Forth, Firth of
Dredgings, Damage to Fish Caused by Method of Discharging.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 29,* 540.

France
Trade Report Presented, *May 6,* 1202.

Free Labour Association
London and North-Western Railway, Allegations as to Payment made by.
Qs. Col. Lockwood, *Apr. 25,* 352, 354; Mr. C. Edwards, 353; Mr. H. Cox, 358.

French Estate, Tipperary
Sale Proposals for.
Qs. Mr. Hogan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 50.

Galloway, Earl of
Companies Bill, *Com.*; *May 2,* 1006.

Galway
County Council Grant, Information as to Deduction from.
Q. Mr. J. Roche; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6,* 1313.
Graziers, Protection of—Threatening Resolution Passed by Clonfert United Irish League.
Q. Marquess of Hamilton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 2,* 1075, 1076.

Galwey's Divorce Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Apr. 29,* 461.

Gambling in Shares, &c.
Protection of bonâ-fide Investors from, proposed.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 29,* 516.

Gargrie
Labourer's Cottage Application of J. Reilly.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1,* 883.

Gas Companies (Removal of Sulphur Restrictions) Bill
l. Rep. Apr. 30,* 629.
3R.* *May 2,* 994.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill
l. 1R.* *Apr. 30,* 630.

Gas and Water Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill
l. 1R.* *Apr. 30,* 630.

Gawran
Gaffney, T., Case of—Procedure in Trial, etc.
Qs. Mr. Meagher; Mr. Ashley; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25,* 284-286.

Geevagh
Band—Circumstances of Firing Gun by Conlon.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25,* 253.

Germany
Naval Shipbuilding Programme, *see under* Navy—Shipbuilding.
Saxony—Trade Report Presented, *May 2,* 995.
Smallpox at Metz—Origin of Vaccine Lymph used in Germany, etc.
Qs. Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Burns *Apr. 30,* 698, 699.

Gibraltar
- Naval Works at, Expenditure on. *Os.* Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 296.

Gilhooly, Mr. J. [Cork Co., W.]
- Browne, Bird and O'Donovan Estates, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 25*, 286.

Ginnell, Mr. L. [Westmeath, N.]
- Charitable Donations and Bequests—Commissioners, Powers and Duties of, *Apr. 24*, 9, 44.
- Civil Service Estimates, Class 3, Vote 14, Subhead F., Supply of Details under, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 249, 1050.
- Congested Districts Board (Scotland)—Land Acquired by, and new Holdings Formed, etc., *May 2*, 1044.
- Estate Duty Valuations, Persons Qualified to make, *May 2*, 1049.
- Killna Castle Untenanted Lands, Purchase of, proposed, *May 1*, 870.
- Labourers Acts, Allotments under—Granting Powers to District Councils, proposed, *May 2*, 1141, 1142.
- Land Act, 1903
  - Guarantee Fund, Sums Drawn from and Repaid to since 1903, *May 2*, 1040.
  - Transactions under, *Apr. 29*, 515.
  - Treasury Rules, Amendments proposed to be made in, *May 2*, 1041.
- Land Commission—Pink Schedule, Information recorded in, *May 1*, 870.
- Land Purchase
  - Financial Working, Inquiry into or Opportunity for Discussion, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 64.
  - Report, Date of presenting, *May 1*, 871.
  - Uneconomic Holdings, Means of Paying Rent on and Application of Rule in Blake-Foster Case to Purchase of, *May 1*, 892.
- Local Government Board, Expenditure by, Increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1140.
- Scottish Crofters' Commission, Land Acquired by and Work of, *May 2*, 1044.
- Smythe, Colonel, Estate of, Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants—Case of E. Fagan, etc., *Apr. 24*, 43.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*Secretary of State for the Home Department* [Leeds, W.]
- Aliens
  - Exclusion and Deportation of Undesirables, Necessity for—Presentment by Grand Jury of Central Criminal Court, *Apr. 29*, 531.
  - Naturalisation Certificates Granted in 1906, and Proposals for Reducing Fees, *Apr. 24*, 27.

Gladstone, Rt. Hon H. J.—*cont.*
- Belfast Factories
  - Female Inspector, Provision of, *Apr. 25*, 287; *May 1*, 868.
  - Number of Employees in, *Apr. 25*, 286.
- Bishopstoke Church, Consecration of, *May 6*, 1317.
- Cabs, Privilege System, Negotiations as to, *Apr. 25*, 271.
- Calico, Dressing used in Manufacturing—Cause of Death of Ann Wilson, *Apr. 30*, 696.
- Cartridges, Illegal Storage of in Certain Northern Towns, *May 6*, 1350.
- Chiswick Council Chamber—Action of Police in Case of Councillor O'Brien, *May 2*, 1063.
- Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Procedure with and Proposals as to, *Apr. 25*, 271, 272.
- Compulsory Weighing and Measurements Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1179–1182, 1183, 1185.
- Edalji Case Inquiry—Date of Presenting Report, *Apr. 25*, 274.
- Factories and Workshops
  - Inspectors, Assistant, Duties of, *Apr. 29*, 532.
  - Young Persons, Employment of—Measures taken to give Publicity to Order No. 680, *Apr. 29*, 532.
- "Hyson," ss.—Cause of Fatal Accident to Meakin and proposals for Preventing Similar Accidents, *Apr. 24*, 28; *Apr. 25*, 241.
- Juvenile Offenders
  - Convictions (October to December, 1906) in certain Cities, *Apr. 25*, 238.
  - Special Courts held for, *May 6*, 1316.
- Liquor Traffic—London County Compensation Fund, Information as to, *May 6*, 1348, 1349.
- Liverpool Dock Regulations, Breaches of, by certain Ships, *Apr. 25*, 242.
- London Ambulances for Street Accidents, Provision of—Date of Issue of Committee Report, *Apr. 24*, 16.
- Magistrates—Poor Law Guardians as, Right to Adjudicate in certain Cases, *Apr. 29*, 505.
- Messengers Appointed to Home Office in 1906–7, *May 1*, 847.
- "Mikado," Withdrawal of Licence from, *May 6*, 1347, 1348.
- Mines, Hours of Labour in—Proposals for Shortening, *Apr. 29*, 505.
- Motor Omnibuses—Complaints as to Refusals to Stop for intending Passengers, *May 2*, 1039.

[*cont.*

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.—*cont.*
Paddington Borough Council
Home-workers employed by—Reason for Refusal to Supply Addresses, *May 2*, 1064.
Refusal to take Proceedings against certain Local Traders, Reason for, etc., *Apr. 24*, 33.
Parliament Street Post Office, Sentence on J. Baines for Theft of Ink-Pot from, *Apr. 29*, 506.
Railway Passengers, Measures for Protecting from Bad Characters attending Race-Meetings, *Apr. 29*, 531.
Sheriff, Allowances to, for Expenses in connection with Elections, the Entertainment of Judges, etc., *Apr. 25*, 241.
Shop Hours Act, Failure of—Necessity for more Drastic Legislation with regard to Closing of Shops and Hours of Shop Assistants, *May 1*, 968–972.
Vaccination Prosecution, Case of G. Reeves, *Apr. 30*, 696, 697.
Vivisection Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *May 1*, 868.

Glamorganshire
Schools, Reason for Increase in Cost of Maintaining.
Qs. Mr. D. A. Thomas, Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 25*, 275, 276.

Glenbeigh
Inquiry into Case of M. O'Sullivan.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 46.

Glendinning, Mr. R. [Antrim, N.]
Antrim—Income-Tax Appeals, Place of Hearing in the North, *Apr. 24*, 64.
Ballymoney Labourers' Cottages—Application of A. Thompson, *Apr. 24*, 60.

Glover, Mr. T. [St. Helen's]
Mines, Hours of Labour in—Proposals for Shortening, *Apr. 29*, 505.

Gordon, Mr. J. [Londonderry, S.]
Upperlands, Outrage at House of Mr. W. Tomb—Prosecution of Arrested Persons, etc., *May 1*, 855.

Gortnahoctee
Postman, Assault on.
Q. Mr. Courthope; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 30*, 713, 714.

Government Departments
(*see also names of Departments as* Post Office, etc.)
Irish Office in London and Dublin, Messengers Appointed to.
Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 501.

Government Departments—*cont.*
Manufactured Articles obtained from Abroad (1893–1906).
Q. Mr. T. R. Bethell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 1*, 858.
Messengerships, Appointments to.
Qs. Sir S. Scott; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 25*, 288.
Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 29*, 541.
Saturday Half-holiday Regulations.
Qs. Mr. Sheehan, Mr. G. A. Hardy, *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 25*, 280, 281.
Q. Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 6*, 1317.

Granard, Earl of
Colonial Shipping Conference—Reason for Non-Representation of Merchant Service Guild, *Apr. 30*, 659, 660.
Companies Bill, *Com.*, *May 2*, 997, 998, 999, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1005, 1007, 1008, 1010, 1011, 1013, 1017, 1018, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024, 1025, 1028, 1030.

Grays and Tilbury Gas Bill
c. Con. Apr. 26*, 373.
3R.* *Apr. 30*, 661.
l. 1R.* *May 1*, 821.

Great Central Railway Bill
c. Rep. May 2*, 1033.
Board of Trade Report Presented, *Apr. 24*, 5.

Great Northern and City Railway Bill
c. Con., May 6, 1424.

Great Yarmouth Port and Haven Bill
c. Con. May 3*, 1165.

Great Yarmouth Waterworks and Lowestoft Water and Gas Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *Apr. 30*, 629.

Greenwood, Mr. G. [Peterborough]
Land Transfers, Sales and Mortgages, Costs Incurred in—Return proposed, *May 2*, 1080, 1081.
Marines, Royal—New Regulations as to Officers, *Apr. 30*, 682; *May 2*, 1052.
Transvaal Chinese Labour—Circumstances of Admitting Unlicensed Coolies, *May 6*, 1335.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs* [Northumberland, Berwick]
Asia Minor—Mersina, British Consular Representation at, *May 2*, 1063.

[*cont.*

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*cont.*
- Canada
  - Negotiations with Foreign Powers, Proper Channels for, *Apr. 25*, 265.
  - Tariff Arrangements with Foreign Powers—Effect on British Preferential Rates, *Apr. 25*, 264.
- Egypt
  - Administration—Cause for Dismissal of Officials, *Apr. 25*, 266.
  - Assouan Dam, Allocation of Contract for Raising, *Apr. 30*, 694.
  - Children, Destitute, Provision of Homes for, proposed, *May 2*, 1060.
  - Civil Service
    - Board for Selection of Candidates, Information as to, *Apr. 25*, 268.
    - Syrians in, *Apr. 25*, 267.
  - Date Tax, Abolition of, proposed, *Apr. 30*, 695.
  - Denshawai Village, Law Authorising Penalty Inflicted on, *Apr. 30*, 694.
  - Destitution in, *May 2*, 1061.
  - Factories and Mines, Introduction of Legislation to deal with, proposed, *Apr. 30*, 696.
  - Press, Proposals for Restricting Freedom of, *Apr. 25*, 269.
  - Sanitation, Improvement of, proposed, *May 2*, 1060.
- Hague Conference—British Delegates, Instructions to be given to, *Apr. 25*, 268.
- Japan—Tokio British Embassy Medical Officer, Qualifications of, *Apr. 30*, 671.
- Macedonia—Condition of Vilayets, Reports Received on, *Apr. 25*, 263.
- Mesopotamia—Concession of Oil Deposits, *Apr. 25*, 265.
- "Mikado," Withdrawal of Licence, Responsibility for, *May 2*, 1062.
- New Hebrides—Anglo-French Committee, Date of Meeting, *May 6*, 1307.
- Nicaragua—Salado, Circumstances of Cutting Down of British Flag, *May 2*, 1059.
- Persia
  - Anglo-Russian Negotiations, Progress of, *Apr. 25*, 268.
  - National Bank, German Assistance in Establishment of, *Apr. 25*, 266.
- Russia—British Fleet, Projected Visit of in May, *May 2*, 1059.
- Soudan
  - Bahr-el-Ghazal—Date of Congolese Evacuation, *Apr. 25*, 264.
  - Christian Missions, Danger of Conflict among Natives involved in Official Encouragement of, *Apr. 25*, 267.
  - Civil Service, Syrians in, *Apr. 25*, 267.

Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir E.—*cont.*
- Turkey
  - Customs Increase
    - Opportunity for Parliamentary Discussion, *Apr. 30*, 693.
    - Position of Negotiations, *Apr. 25*, 263; *May 1*, 867.
  - Salonica—Circumstances of Capture of Mr. Abbott by Brigands, *May 2*, 1061.
- United States
  - Companies Registered during 1906, *Apr. 25*, 265.
  - Pensions paid by Government, *Apr. 25*, 236.
- White Slave Traffic—Proposals for Tabling Papers of International Congress, *Apr. 29*, 504.

Greystones
- Harbour Works, Proposals as to.
  - *Os.* Sir T. Esmonde, *May 2*, 1126; Mr. Runciman, 1127, 1128.

Gublaun
- Police Duties in Maintenance of Peace, Latest Occasion of exercising.
  - *Q.* Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 233.

Guiana, British
- Sugar Production and Export (1900–1905), Return Ordered, *May 1*, 843.

Gulland, Mr. J. W. [Dumfries Burghs]
- Edinburgh Grassmarket, Legality of holding Cattlemarket in, *May 6*, 1310.
- Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26*, 406–408.

Gurdon, Sir W. B. [Norfolk, N.]
- Committee, Standing Scottish—Wording of Notification as to Appointment of Members, *Apr. 30*, 715.
- Transvaal Chinese Labour—Circumstances of Landing of Unlicensed Coolies, *May 2*, 1057.

Gwynn, Mr. [Galway]
- Education, Intermediate Inspection System, Decision as to, *May 1*, 886.

Haddock, Mr. G. B. [Lancs., N., Lonsdale]
- British Museum Reading Room, Redecoration of—Reason for requiring Gold-leaf of British Manufacture, *Apr. 29*, 498.

Hague Conference
- British Delegates
  - Instructions to be given to.
    - *Q.* Mr. Byles; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 268.
  - Powers of, as to Question of Limitation of Armaments.
    - *Q.* Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 24*, 33.

[*cont.*

Hague Conference—*cont.*
  Disarmament Proposals—Effect of German Attitude on British Expenditure on Armaments.
    Q. Captain Craig; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1356.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*Secretary of State for War* [Haddington]
  Africa, South
    Constabulary, Strength of and Purpose of Maintenance, *Apr. 29*, 521.
    Garrison—Strength, Cost and Purpose of Maintaining, *Apr. 29*, 521, 522.
  Artillery
    Cost under Present System and under New Scheme, *Apr. 24*, 19.
    Garrison, Strength of—Effect of Check on Recruiting, *Apr. 29*, 517.
  Auxiliary Forces, Proposals as to, under New Scheme, *Apr. 29*, 497, 522, 523.
  Bayonet, New, Pattern of, *May 6*, 1326.
  Bexhill—War Office Land, Sale of, *Apr. 42*, 19.
  Bulford Camp—Accommodation for Married Establishment of Scots Greys, *May 1*, 864.
  Bullets, Small-bore, Result of Inquiry into, *Apr. 24*, 17.
  Cavalry
    Cause for Increase of Military Offences among, *May 6*, 1306.
    Scotland, Proposals for allocating to, *May 6*, 1326, 1329.
    Sword, Decision as to, *May 6*, 1325.
  Colonial Militia and Volunteers, Information as to, in Army List, *Apr. 24*, 17.
  Courts-Martial during 1905–6, *Apr. 29*, 519, 520.
  Duke of York's School, Accommodation for, at Dover—Reason for not providing the same as at Chelsea, *Apr. 30*, 680.
  Engineer Services
    Improvement of Position of Staff, Proposals for, *May 6*, 1328.
    Surveyors' Salaries, Decision as to, *May 1*, 861.
  Expenditure, Increase in, *May 6*, 1327.
  Fleetwood Camp, Troops to be trained at, *Apr. 30*, 685.
  General Staff—Cost entailed by Resolution of Colonial Conference, *Apr. 30*, 685.
  Hamilton Barracks, Seams of Coal under—Reason for not continuing Operations in extracting, *Apr. 29*, 525.
  Lyddite Shells made at Ordnance Factories, Cause for Rejection of, *May 6*, 1330, 1331.

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
  Militia
    Artillery, Garrison—Ammunition to be issued for Training, *Apr. 25*, 236; *Apr. 29*, 523; *May 2*, 1054.
    Reserve, Proposals as to, under New Scheme, *May 6*, 1306.
    Terms of Service, Effect of New Bill on, *Apr. 29*, 502.
  Officers—Colonels, Honorary Rank of, on Retirement, *Apr. 29*, 524.
  Ordnance Factory Adult Employees earning less than 30s. per week, *Apr. 30*, 685.
  Pensions, Period for Payment of, *Apr. 29*, 517.
  Pimlico Clothing Factory—Adult Male Employees earning less than 30s. per Week, *Apr. 30*, 685.
  Rifle Clubs, Issue of Old Rifles to, proposed, *Apr. 29*, 518.
  Rifles
    Proposals for converting, *Apr. 24*, 18; *Apr. 29*, 518.
    Sub-Target Rifle, Decision as to Adoption of, *Apr. 30*, 685.
  Sandhurst Cadets, Cause for Delay in Gazetting, *May 1*, 864.
  Scots Greys—Date of leaving Scotland, *May 6*, 1329.
  Soldiers
    Education Certificates, Inducements to obtain, *Apr. 29*, 520.
    Families, Rule compelling Support of—Case of T. Sonden, *May 1*, 861.
    Number sentenced to Penal Servitude in 1906, *Apr. 29*, 494, 519.
  Strength in 1905 and at present Time, *Apr. 29*, 517.
  Superannuation—Reckoning Army non-Pensionable Service with Civil Service Time, *Apr. 26*, 386.
  Territorial Force (Second Line)
    Camp Pay and Allowance, *Apr. 30*, 683, 684.
    Camp Training, Period for and Cost of Allowance, *May 6*, 1329.
    Lance-Corporals, Separation Allowance for, *May 6*, 1327.
    Messing and Camp Allowance, Person authorised to Expend, *May 6*, 1326.
    Nomenclature proposed for, *May 6*, 1328.
    Walking-out Uniforms, Provision of, *May 6*, 1326.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill
    Allocation of Time to various Stages, Proposals as to, *May 6*, 1390–1394.

[*cont.*

Haldane, Rt. Hon. R. B.—*cont.*
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—*cont.*
  - Artillery, Volunteer, Proposals as to, *May 6*, 1390.
  - Clauses 5–40, allowing extra Day for Discussion of, proposed, *May 6*, 1453.
  - Cost of the Scheme, *May 6*, 1446-1448.
  - County Associations
    - Constitution and Duties of, *Apr. 29*, 524.
    - Funds, Expenditure of, *May 2*, 1054; *May 6*, 1307.
  - Financial Resolution, Exemption of from Closure, proposed, *May 6*, 1423, 1446.
  - Increased Estimate, Measures proposed for showing, *May 6*, 1307.
  - Militia, Regulations as to Enlistment in Special Reserve, *May 6*, 1392, 1393.
  - Reorganisation under, proposals for carry-out, *May 6*, 1329,
- Volunteers—Crossan, Gunner, Case of, *Apr. 29*, 522.
- War Office
  - Messengers Appointed in 1906–7, *Apr. 30*, 681.
  - Military Staff, Information as to, *Apr. 30*, 671, 686.
- Woolwich Arsenal
  - Adult Employees earning less than 30s. per Week, *Apr. 30*, 685.
  - Allocation of Army and Navy Work to, in Order to prevent Discharges, *May 6*, 1330.
  - Discharges
    - Assistance, Proposals for, *Apr. 29*, 503.
    - Number projected—Proposals for working on Short Time, etc., *Apr. 29*, 525–527; *May 1*, 865.
- Yeomanry—King's Colonial Imperial Yeomanry, Permission for furnishing Guard of Honour by, at Banquet to Colonial Premiers, *Apr. 24*, 18.

Halpin, Mr. J. [Clare, W.]
- Ballaghaline Fishing Pier, Necessity for proceeding with, *Apr. 30*, 710.
- Clare Evicted Tenants—Reinstatements effected, *Apr. 30*, 709.

Halsall Charity
- New Scheme, Date of Publication.
  - *Qs.* Sir G. Kekewich, Lord Balcarres; *As.* Mr. Lough, *Apr. 24*, 39, 40.

Halsbury, Earl of
- House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1272–1281.
- Prohibition of Medical Practice by Companies Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 467.

Hammersmith
- Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Property leased for Exhibition Purposes—Provision as to Liquor Licence.
  - *Q.* Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Tomkinson, *Apr. 24*, 41.

Hamilton, Marquess of [Londonderry]
- Galway Graziers, Protection of—Threatening Resolution passed by Clonfert United Irish League, *May 2*, 1075.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. L.—*First Commissioner of Works* [Lancashire, N.E., Rossendale]
- British Museum Reading-room, Re-decoration of—Reason for requiring Gold Leaf of British Manufacture, *Apr. 29*, 499.
- Carnarvon Castle, Expenditure on, during last ten Years, *Apr. 26*, 382.
- Kensington Gardens—Forcing Frames, etc., Proposals for removing, *Apr. 29*, 505.
- Richmond Park Road from Richmond Hill Gate to Kingston Gate, Date of completing Repairs, *May 1*, 859.

Hardwicke, Earl of
- Navy—Nucleus Crews, Working of System, *May 1*, 838.

Hardy, Mr. G. A. [Suffolk, Stowmarket]
- Government Departments—Saturday Half-Holiday Regulations, *Apr. 25*, 281.

Hardy, Mr. L. [Kent, Ashford]
- Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Allocation of Time to Various Stages, Proposals, *May 6*, 1382–1384.

Harewood, Earl of
- Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 473.

Harmood-Banner, Mr. J. S. [Liverpool, Everton]
- War Taxes, Reasons for continuing as a Permanent Charge, *May 1*, 931, 932.

Harmsworth, Mr. C. B. [Worcester, Droitwich]
- Agriculture and Fisheries Grant, Increase of, proposed, *May 6*, 1311.
- Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26*, 408–410.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness]
- Dunnet Bay, Illegal Trawling in—Date of Last Visit of Cruiser, *May 1*, 869.

Hart-Davies, Mr. T. [Hackney, N.]
- Bombay
  - Council—Qualifications of Sind Member, *May 1*, 859.
  - Procedure in Trial of Chief of Aundh, *May 6*, 1320.

Hartlepool
Halley's Field Upper School, Teaching of Rifle-shooting at.
Qs. Mr. Summerbell; *As.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 30*, 702.

Harvey, Mr. A. G. C. [Rochdale]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Procedure with and Proposals as to, *Apr. 25*, 273.

Haslam, Mr. L. [Monmouth Boroughs]
Poor Law Children—Number dependent on Poor Relief, *Apr. 24*, 25.

Haversham, Lord
Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 478.

Hay, Mr. C. G. D. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]
Motor Omnibuses—Complaints as to Refusals to stop for intending Passengers, *May 2*, 1039.
Newfoundland Fisheries—Date of tabling Papers, *May 1*, 866.
Persia—Progress of Anglo-Russian Negotiations as to, *May 1*, 867.
Russo-Japanese War—Result of Negotiations as to Claims for British Vessels sunk by Russian Cruisers, *May 1*, 867.
Woolwich Arsenal Discharges—Number projected, *May 1*, 865.

Hayden, Mr. J. P. [Roscommon, S.]
Ballintubber — Hostile Demonstrations against Mr. Payne, *May 1*, 875.
County Councils, Names of and Arrangements made with Banks by, *May 2*, 1050.
Evictions—Progress made with Reinstatements, *May 1*, 889.
Land Purchase Funds, Amount lying in Banks without Interest, *Apr. 24*, 64, 65.
Taxation Surveyors Clerks, *Status* of—Inquiry proposed, *May 2*, 1069.

Hazel, Dr. A. E. W. [West Bromwich]
Yeomanry—King's Colonial Imperial Yeomanry, Permission for furnishing Guard of Honour by, at Banquet to Colonial Premiers, *Apr. 24*, 18.

Hazleton, Mr. R. [Galway, N.]
O'Rorke Estate, Purchase Proposals for, *Apr. 29*, 512.

Helmsley, Lord [Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk]
Agriculture Board Staff, Salaries of, *Apr. 29*, 537.
Land Policy of the Government, *Apr. 29*, 547.
Transvaal Chinese Labour, Repatriation projected, *May 6*, 1335.

Hemmerde, Mr. [Denbighshire]
London Municipal Society, Subscription to by London and North Western Railway, *Apr. 25*, 364, 365.
London and North Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 364, 365.

Heneage, Lord
House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1248–1250.

Henderson, Mr. J. McD. [Aberdeenshire, W.]
Intestate Husbands' Estate (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1186.

Herbert, Colonel [Monmouthshire, S.]
Land Transfers, Sales and Mortgages, Costs incurred in—Return proposed, *May 2*, 1081.

Herbert, Mr. T. A. [Buckinghamshire, Wycombe]
London and North Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 367.
Railway Subscriptions to Party Organisations, Prohibition of—Legislative Proposals, *Apr. 25*, 367.

Hervey, Captain F. W. F. [Bury St. Edmunds]
Navy—Docking Accommodation for large Vessels, *Apr. 25*, 314, 315.

Higham, Mr. J. S. [Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby]
Administration of Ireland, Boards engaged in—Return proposed, *May 3*, 1171.
Mersina, British Consular Representation at, *May 2*, 1063.

Hill, Sir C. L. [Shrewsbury]
Africa, East
  Game Preservation, Measures taken for, *May 2*, 1039.
  Kilindini Harbour, Proposals for Improving, *May 2*, 1039.
Army—Territorial Forces, Nomenclature proposed for, *May 6*, 1328.
Uganda—Game Preservation, Measures taken for, *May 2*, 1039.

Hire-Purchase Agreements
Stamp Duty—Resolution Reported, *May 1*, 903.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, *May 1*, 945; Mr. Asquith, 945, 946; Mr. Rawlinson, 946; Mr. S. Wilson, 946.

Historical Manuscripts
Bath, Marquess of—Calendar of MSS. preserved at Longleat, Presented, *May 6*, 1202, 1301.
Portland, Duke of—Report on MSS. preserved at Welbeck Abbey, Presented, *May 6*, 1202, 1301.

Hobart, Sir R. [Hampshire, New Forest]
Army—Colonels, Honorary Rank of, on Retirement, *Apr. 29*, 524.

Hobhouse, Mr. C. E. H.—*Under-Secretary for India* [Bristol, E.]
Assam Coolie Children, Facilities for Education of, *May 2*, 1055.
Bhagalpur District Magistrate—Alleged Improper use of Influence with Indian Gentlemen, *Apr. 30*, 686, 687.
Budget, Date of Discussing, *Apr. 30*, 687; *May 2*, 1055.
Liquors and Drugs, Excise and Customs Revenues on (1903–6), *Apr. 30*, 687.
Opium Shops—Number Licensed (1903–7), *Apr. 30*, 687.

Hodge, Mr. J. [Lancashire, S.E., Gorton]
Compulsory Weighing and Measurements Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1176–1179, 1183.

Hogan, Mr. M. [Tipperary, N.]
French Estate, Tipperary, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 24*, 50.

Holland, Sir W. H. [Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham]
Channel Tunnel Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 345–347.
Limited Partnerships Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1191–1194.

Home Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.
Under-Secretary—Mr. H. Samuel.
Messengers appointed in 1906–7.
Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 1*, 846, 847.

Hong Kong
Dockyard and Coaling Facilities for the Navy, Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 296.

Hooper, Mr. A. G. [Dudley]
Railway Companies and Board of Trade, Correspondence between—Matters included in Arrangements referred to, *May 2*, 1038.

Horniman, Mr. E. J. [Chelsea]
Duke of York's School, Accommodation for, at Dover—Reason for not providing the same as at Chelsea, *Apr. 30*, 680.

House of Commons
See under Parliament.

House of Lords
See under Parliament.

House of Lords (Reform) Bill
l. 2R., *May 6*, 1203.
Debate on Second Reading (Lords) *May 6*, 1203.
Date of coming into Operation, 1206.
Former Attempts at Reform, 1204, 1205, 1224, 1225.
Functions of the Second Chamber, Definition of, 1246, 1286.
House of Commons, Allowing Peers not returned as Representative Peers to stand for, 1213, 1214.
Irish Church Bill of 1869, and Irish Home Rule Bill of 1893, Attitude of House of Lords towards, 1264, 1270.
Liberal Peers, Proportion of, 1218.
Life Peers, Proposals as to Creation of, 1213, 1234, 1289, 1293.
Mandate for Alteration in Constitution of the House, 1256–1258, 1278, 1281.
Origin of the Second Chamber, 1271.
Party Character of the House of Lords, 1227–1230, 1238, 1242, 1252, 1286.
Peers returned twice to House of Commons before becoming a Peer to be qualified as a Hereditary Peer, 1207, 1208, 1220.
Privy Councillors, Position of, 1207.
Referring Bill to Select Committee, proposed, 1250, 1283, 1284, 1290.
Schedule defining "Qualified" Peers, 1206, 1207, 1255.
Select Committee to consider Reform Proposals, Appointment of, proposed, 1216, 1222, 1223, 1226, 1233, 1242, 1245, 1250, 1253, 1254, 1268, 1278, 1283.
Spiritual Peers, Proposals as to Reduction of Representation, 1212, 1277.
Unqualified Peers to Elect One-fourth of their Number at the beginning of each Parliament, 1208, 1260.
Writs to be issued only to "Qualified" Peers, 1206, 1217, 1218, 1259.

Housing of the Working Classes
Legislative Proposals as to Transfer of Powers from Rural District Councils.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 24*, 38, 39.

Hunt, Mr. R. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Admiralty Contracts, Conditions of—Specification as to British Materials, *May 6*, 1324, 1325.
Coastguard Stations closed, Disposal of Men, *Apr. 25*, 256.

[*cont.*

Hunt, Mr. R.—*cont.*
- Colonial Conference, 1907—Proceedings, Arrangements for Publishing, *Apr. 25*, 262, 263.
- Fiscal Policy—British Capital driven Abroad under Present System, *Apr. 24*, 127–129.
- Motors, Increased Taxation on, Proposed, *Apr.* 24, 130.
- Navy
  - Policy as to Increase of Power, *Apr. 25*, 289.
  - Shipbuilding
    - Bottom-plates, Place of Manufacture of, *May 1*, 861.
    - Facilities for buying Foreign Material under Present Conditions, *May 1*, 861, 862.
  - Works, Granite used in, Source of Origin of, *Apr. 25*, 332.
- Post Office—Chief Medical Officer, Salary of, *May 1*, 845.
- Shop Hours Act, Failure of—Necessity for more Drastic Legislation with regard. to Closing of Shops and Hours of Shop Assistants, *May 1*, 978.
- Woolwich Arsenal, Number of Discharges from, *Apr. 29*, 527.
- Workmen's Compensation Act—Legality of Charge for insuring Parish Council Clerk and Overseer, *Apr. 29*, 533.

Hutton, Mr. A. E. [Yorkshire, W.R., Morley]
- Education Act, 1870—Effect of Repeal of Section 16, *Apr. 30*, 704.
- Worthing Gas Bill, *Con.*, *Apr. 29*, 610–612.

Hyde, Mr. C. G. [Wednesbury]
- Companies, Limited, in Foreign Countries, Compulsory Reserve Fund for, *Apr. 30*, 673.

Hylton, Lord
- Dental Companies (Restriction of Practice) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 470.
- Prohibition of Medical Practice by Companies Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 464–467.

"Hyson" S.S.
- Cause of Fatal Accident to Meakin, and Proposals for preventing Similar Accidents.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 24*, 28.
  - *Q.* Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 25*, 241.

Imports and Exports
- *See* Exports and Imports.

Incest Bill
- c. 1R.* *May 1*, 991

Inchinasingane
- Rent Recovery Proceedings in Bankruptcy Courts, Custom as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 63.

Income Tax
- Abolition of Repayments in Respect of Assessment on Average Income.
  - *Resolution* [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 24*, 135; Reported, *May 1*, 958.
- Assessment
  - Forms—Reason for use of 1907 Forms in London for Particulars as to 1907–8.
    - *Q.* Sir W. Bull; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 29*, 490, 491.
  - Trades, etc., recently commenced
    - *Resolution* [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 24*, 135; Reported, *May 1*, 958.
  - Trading Concerns with Fluctuating Profits, Application of Average System to.
    - *Q.* Lord Balcarres; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 6*, 1304.
- Collection—Assimilating System to that prevailing in Scotland, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. McCrae, *Apr. 24*, 99; Mr. Sears, 104.
- Companies, Limited, Liability of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 25*, 270, 271.
- Continuance of, at 1s. in the Pound.
  - *Resolution* [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 24*, 72; Reported, *May 1*, 956, 991.
- Earned Incomes up to £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the Pound, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. H. Beach, *Apr. 24*, 73; Mr. S. T. Evans, 86, 87; Mr. V. Cavendish, 92; Mr. McCrae, 98; Mr. J. F. Mason, 102; Mr. Bowles, 110–112; Mr. C. Money, 115; Mr. T. Taylor, 131.
  - Burden of Proof to rest with the Claimant, and Claim to be made together with the Return, etc.
    - *Os.* Mr. Sears, *Apr. 24*, 105.
  - Pensions, Annuities, etc., Position of.
    - *Os.* Mr. Smeaton, *Apr. 24*, 125–127.
- Ecclesiastical Incomes, Abatement permitted to be claimed on.
  - *Q.* Captain Balfour; *A.* Mr. Asquith *May 1*, 859.
- Evasions, Penalties for—Increase and Extension of Period, for Recovery, proposed.
  - *Os.* Mr. Bowles, *Apr. 24*, 111.
- Graduation—Report and Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry.
  - *Os.* Mr. S. T. Evans, *Apr. 24*, 85, 87, 88; Mr. V. Cavendish, 90, 91; Mr. Bowles, 110.

[*cont.*

Income Tax—*cont.*

Inclusion of all Offices and Employment in Schedule E.
Resolution [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 24*, 133; Reported, *May 1*, 957.

Ireland, Issue of Statement as to Collection in, proposed.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 26*, 376.

Limitation on Aggregate Amount of Deductions or Repayments for Wear and Tear.
Resolution [Mr. Asquith], *Apr. 24*, 134, 135; Reported, *May 1*, 957.

Married Persons, Separate Assessment of Incomes, proposed.
Os. Sir W. Bull, *Apr. 24*, 119; Mr. Asquith, 120; Mr. Bottomley, 122.

Police Pensions, Liability of.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; Mr. Barlow; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *May 2*, 1068, 1069.

Reduction of 1d. in the Pound, proposed.
Os. Mr. S. Roberts, *May 1*, 959.

Relation of Death Duties to Incidence of.
Os. Mr. H. Beach, *Apr. 24*, 72, 73.

Returns

- Compulsory filling up of Forms, Proposals as to.
  Os. Mr. McCrae, *Apr. 24*, 98, 99; Mr. Bowles, 111.
- Estimated Effect of, on Receipts.
  Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 25*, 232.
- Employers to give Particulars of all Salaries paid.
  Os. Mr. S. T. Evans, *Apr. 24*, 88; Mr. McCrae, 99; Mr. Bowles, 111; Mr. C. Money, 116; Mr. T. Taylor, 132.

Schedule E—Practice as to Servants of English Companies resident Abroad.
Q. Mr. Cleland; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 26*, 381, 382.

Small Shareholders who are also Employees, Scale of Payment for.
Q. Mr. Wiles; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 30*, 705.

Super-tax on Incomes over £2,000, proposed.
Os. Mr. Snowden, *Apr. 24*, 81.

Swinburn, Green and Herron, Messrs., Reason for Refusal of Repayment of Interest to.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 29*, 536.

Wasting Security, Income derived from—Definition as Earned or Unearned.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 30*, 676, 677.

India

Arbuthnot & Co., Insolvency of—Investigation proposed.
Q. Mr. Smeaton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 25*, 258, 259.

Army

- Pensions of Officers' Widows—Amount paid on Residence in India or England.
  Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 24*, 29.
- Strength and Expenditure in 1900, 1901, 1902, and 1906–7.
  Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 30*, 672.

Assam Coolie Children, Facilities for Education of.
Q. Mr. H. Beach; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *May 2*, 1055.

Bengal Education Staff, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. McCallum; *As.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 25*, 259.

Bhagalpur District Magistrate—Alleged Improper use of Influence with Indian Gentlemen.
Qs. Mr. O'Grady, Sir H. Cotton; *As.* Mr. C. Hobhouse, *Apr. 30*, 686, 687.

Bombay

- Aundh, Chief of—Procedure in Trial
  Q. Mr. Hart Davies; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 6*, 1320.
- Council—Qualifications of Sind Member.
  Q. Mr. Hart-Davies; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 1*, 859, 860.

Budget, Date of discussing.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Apr. 30*, 687.
Q. Mr. Ellis; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *May 2*, 1055.

Calcutta

- Improvement Scheme, Position of—Opinion of Residents, etc.
  Q. Mr. C. E. Price; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr 25*, 260.
- Memorial to Queen Victoria, Date of completing
  Q. Mr. Fell; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 29*, 500.

Council, Minute as to Extension of Term of Sir J. L. Mackay's Office, Presented, *Apr. 29*, 463, 489.

Excise Committee Report—Return of Orders of Indian Government Presented, *May 6*, 1302.

Financial Statement (1907–8)—Return Ordered, *May 2*, 1035.

Gold Standard Reserve, *see under* Coinage and Currency.

India—*cont.*

Lahore Disturbances

University Measures for Repressing Political Excesses among Students, Government Support to.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May 6,* 1311.

Legislative Councils, Opportunity for Parliamentary Discussion of Proposals as to.
Q. Mr. Smeaton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 25,* 258.

Liquors and Drugs, Excise and Customs Revenues on (1903–1906.)
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Apr. 30,* 687.

Madras Estates Land Bill, Provisions of.
Qs. Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Morley, *May 6,* 1305, 1320, 1321.

Madras High Court Prison Judgeship, Claims of Indian Lawyers to.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 24,* 16, 17.

Opium Shops—Number Licensed 1903–1907.
Q. Mr. H. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Hobhouse, *Apr. 30,* 687.

Plague Reports of College of Physicians, Action taken on.
Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 29,* 499.

Railways

Inquiry—Constitution of Committee.
Qs. Mr. C. E. Price, Mr. Rees; *As.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 25,* 260.

Rolling Stock, Proposals for Increasing, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Mr. Morley, *Apr. 29,* 509.

Rawalpindi Disturbances, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. Rees, Major Anstruther-Gray, Sir H. Cotton, Captain Faber; *As.* Mr. Morley, *May 6,* 1331, 1332.

India Office

Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. J. Morley.

Under-Secretary—Mr. C. E. H. Hobhouse.

Inland Revenue

Amendment of Law relating to—Resolution Reported, *May 1,* 904.

Inland Revenue Department

Reorganisation, Necessity for.
Os. Mr. Sears, *Apr. 24,* 105.

Intestate Husband's Estate (Scotland) Bill

c. 2R., *May 3,* 1185.

Ipswich

Poor Law Labour Yard, Reason for Closing.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 2,* 1047.

Ireland

Chief Secretary—Rt. Hon. A. Birrell.

Lord-Lieutenant—Earl of Aberdeen.

Attorney-General—Rt. Hon. R. R. Cherry.

Solicitor-General—Mr. R. Barry.

[*For* particular Places, Estates, etc., *see their names.*]

Administration

Boards engaged in—Return proposed.
Q. Mr. Higham; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 3,* 1171.

Legislative Proposals as to.
Qs. Mr. Sloan, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 55, 56.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 25,* 289, 290.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department, *see that title.*

Ancient Monuments, Preservation of—Criticisms on Policy of Board of Works.
Os. Mr. Delany, *May 2,* 1116; Sir T. Esmonde, 1124; Mr. Runciman, 1127.

Balances to Credit of Government in Bank of Ireland, Disposal of Interest on.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 30,* 711.

Calendar of Justiciary Rolls, Proposals for Publishing.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30,* 678.

Charitable Donations and Bequests Commissioners, Powers and Duties of.
Qs. Mr. Ginnell; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 9, 10, 44.

Condition of—Statements in Appeal by Lord Ashtown.
Qs. Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. MacNeill, Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, Mr. Speaker, *May 2,* 1076, 1077.

Constabulary Royal Irish, *see that title.*

County and Borough Council Grants, Deductions from, in Respect of Land Purchase.
Qs. Mr. McHugh; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30,* 665, 666, 706, 707.
Q. Mr. Joyce; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1,* 891.

County Councils, Names of and Arrangements made with Banks by.
Q. Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 2,* 1050.

Development Grant Act, 1903—Report of Proceedings under, Presented, *Apr. 25,* 179.

Drainage, Arterial

Appendix to Report Presented, *May 2,* 995, 1035.

[*cont.*

Ireland—*cont.*

- Drainage, Arterial—*cont.*
  - Failure of Board of Works to deal with.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Delany, *May 2*, 1115; Mr. O'Dowd, 1123; Sir T. Esmonde, 1124; Mr. Runciman, 1128, 1129; Mr. J. O'Connor, 1134, 1136.
- Education, *see that title.*
- Evictions
  - Lunatics, Application of Act to—Cases of C. Mullen and C. McDonagh.
    - *Q.* Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 871, 872.
  - Notices—Return Presented, *Apr. 24*, 2, 5.
  - Reinstatements
    - Delay caused by Removal of Inspectors.
      - *Qs.* Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 876, 877.
    - Progress made with.
      - *Q.* Mr. Hayden; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 889, 890.
- Houses in each Province valued at £2 or less.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 3*, 1170, 1171.
- Irish Language, *see that title.*
- Labourers Acts and Cottages, *see title* Labourers (Ireland) Acts.
- Land Commission, Land Judge's Court, Land Purchase, *see those titles.*
- Loan Fund Board—Annual Report Presented, *Apr. 29*, 489; *Apr. 30*, 631.
- Marine Works Act, Expenditure under.
  - *Qs.* Sir T. Esmonde, *May 2*, 1125, 1126; Mr. Runciman, 1127.
- Poor Law, *see that title.*
- Public Accounts, Charges for Audit of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Barrie, *May 2*, 1152; Mr. Birrell, 1160, 1161.
- Religious Persuasion of Officials.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 3*, 1169, 1170.
- Roman Catholic University, Legislative Proposals for—Protests received from Universities and Colleges.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Kettle, Mr. Lonsdale, Mr. Sloan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 51, 52.
  - *Qs.* Viscount Turnour, Mr. Kettle; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 283, 284.
  - *Q.* Mr. Barrie; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 25*, 289.
- Royal University—Report (1906) Presented, *Apr. 29*, 463, 489.
- Trade Statistics—Date of Presenting Report.
  - *Q.* Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 57.

Ireland—*cont.*

- Valuation per Inhabitant per County.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 26*, 376, 378.
- Votes, Unexpended, Amounts saved on, since 1903—Allocation of Money so saved.
  - *Q.* Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 2*, 1040.
- Works Board
  - Administration by, Alleged Failure of.
    - *Qs.* Mr. O'Dowd, *May 2*, 1122, 1123; Mr. Runciman, 1126; Mr. J. O'Connor, 1133, 1134.
  - Constitution of—Qualifications and Salaries of Members.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Delany *May 2*, 1114; Mr. Runciman, 1129, 1130.
  - Inspectors, Original—Betterment of Pensions, proposed.
    - *Qs.* Sir T. Esmonde, *May 2*, 1125.
  - Loans
    - Facilities for Granting Smaller Loans, proposed.
      - *Qs.* Mr. Moore, *May 2*, 1120; Sir T. Esmonde, 1124; Mr. Runciman, 1127.
    - Refusal of Applications, Reason for.
      - *Qs.* Mr. Duffy, *May 2*, 1137.
  - Religious Opinions of Staff—Treatment of Roman Catholics.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Delany, *May 2*, 1117–1119, 1132; Mr. Runciman, 1130–1133.
  - Staff—*Status* of Supernumerary Staff Officer, and Duties of Assistant Secretary.
    - *Q.* Mr. Delany; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 6*, 1354.
  - Statements made by Employees to Members or to the Press, Penalties for.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Delany, *May 2*, 1118; Mr. Moore, 1119; Mr. Runciman, 1131.
  - Vote for, *May 2*, 1113, 1138.

Irish Council Bill

- Time Allotted to First Reading Debate.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Barrie, Capt. Craig; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1361, 1362.

Irish Education Act, 1892

- Disposal of Fines under.
  - *Q.* Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6*, 1321.

Irish Language

- Teaching in Schools, Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. T. O'Donnell, Capt. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 885.

Irish Tobacco Bill
c. Con. Apr. 24*, 176.
3R.* *Apr. 29*, 628.
l. 1R.* *Apr. 30*, 631.

Italy
Trade Report Presented, *Apr. 25*, 178.

Jamaica
Swettenham, Sir A., Resignation of, Correspondence, Information contained in and Decision as to publishing.
Qs. Sir G. Parker, Mr. Bridgeman, Mr. Remnant, Mr. J. Collings; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 30*, 689–692.
Withdrawal, Opportunity given for.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 30*, 692.

Japan
Tokio British Embassy Medical Officer, Qualifications, etc., of.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 30*, 671.

Jardine, Sir, J. [Roxburgh]
Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26*, 443.

"Jebba"
Wreck of—Awards for saving Passengers, etc.
Q. Mr. Mildmay; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 24*, 36, 37.

Jenkins, Mr. J. [Chatham]
Navy
Chatham Dockyard Extensions, Information as to, *Apr. 25*, 310.
Docking Accommodation for large Vessels, *Apr. 25*, 309, 310, 338.

Joicey-Cecil, Lord J. [Lincolnshire, Stamford]
Militia Terms of Service, Effect of Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill on, *Apr. 29*, 502.

Jones, Mr. L. [Westmoreland, Appleby]
Old-age Pensions—Proposals for Penalty on Supply of Intoxicants to Pensioners, *Apr. 25*, 269.
Railway Employees, Rule prohibiting giving of Intoxicants to by the Public, *Apr. 29*, 277, 278.
War Taxes, Reasons for continuing as a Permanent Charge, *May 1*, 939.

Jowett, Mr. F. W. [Bradford, W.]
Towns and Cities, Development of—Granting Powers to Local Authorities to lay out Suburbs on rational lines, *May 1*, 982–985.

Joyce, Mr. M. [Limerick]
County and Borough Council Grants, Deductions from, in respect of Land Purchase, *May 1*, 891.

Joyce, Mr. M.—*cont.*
Lunacy—Expenditure on Irish Asylums in 1906, *Apr. 30*, 709, 710.
Navy—"Antrim," Government responsible for Contract for, *May 1*, 862.

Jurors (Expenses) Bill
c. 2R., *May 3*, 1199.

Juvenile Offenders
Convictions (October to December, 1906), in certain Cities.
Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 25*, 236–238.
Scotland, Treatment in, during 1906—Return ordered, *May 1*, 844.
Special Courts, Information as to.
Q. Mr. J. W. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 6*, 1316.

Kearley, Mr. H. E.—*Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade* [Devonport]
Aliens, Employment of, in East End, and consequent exclusion of English Labour, *Apr. 29*, 534.
Argentina—Tax on Commercial Travellers, *Apr. 29*, 535.
Bankruptcy Laws Inquiry—Date of presenting Report, *May 6*, 1308.
Belfast Operatives, Wages of, *Apr. 29*, 493.
Canadian Tariff Rate on British Goods, *Apr. 25*, 277.
Central London Railway Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1435, 1436.
Coastguard—Cliff Ladders, Regulations as to Supply of, *Apr. 29*, 535.
Great Northern and City Railway Bill, *Con., May 6*, 1427.
London Municipal Society, Subscriptions to, by London and North Western Railway, *Apr. 25*, 366.
London and North Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 365–367.
Railways
Correspondence between Board of Trade and Companies—Matters included in Arrangements referred to, *May 2*, 1028.
Intoxicants given by the Public to Employees, Rule prohibiting, *Apr. 25*, 277, 278.
Lancashire and Yorkshire Company's Agreement with London and North Western, Deposit of, *May 2*, 1064.
Subscriptions to Party Organisations
Prohibition of—Legislative Proposals, *Apr. 25*, 366.
Schedules of Accounts to give Details of, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 366.

[*cont*,

Kearley, Mr. H. E.—*cont.*
Tramways, Street, Brakes for Cars of—Mode of Investigation into Matter, *Apr. 25*, 278.
Woolwich Arsenal Discharged Workmen—Offers of Employment in Germany, *May 2*, 1065.

Kekewich, Sir G. W. [Exeter]
Halsall Charity, New Scheme, Date of Publication, *Apr. 24*, 39, 40.

Kendal Corporation Bill
l. Report from Select Committee, *Apr. 30*, 629.
3R.* *May 5*, 1201.

Kenmare Estate
Reinstatement Claim of D. O'Shea,
Q. Mr. Murphy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6*, 1322, 1323.

Kennedy, Mr. V. P. [Cavan, W.]
Cavan
Fitzpatrick, P., Reinstatement Claim of, *Apr. 26*, 385.
Urban Council By-laws—Number submitted and Decision in each Case, *May 6*, 1314.
Labourers' Cottages—Applicants rejected, Right of Complaint by, *Apr. 24*, 58.
Lanarkshire, Illegitimacy Statistics in, *Apr. 29*, 540.
Land Purchase Transactions in Course of being dealt with, *Apr. 24*, 58.
Lord Chamberlain, Minister responsible to the House for Action or Inaction of, *May 6*, 1348.
"Mikado," Withdrawal of Licence for, *Apr. 29*, 529; *May 2*, 1062.
Poor Law Commission, Scope of and Returns called for by, *May 2*, 1066.

Kensington Gardens
Forcing Frames and Plant Houses, Proposals for Removal of.
Q. Sir G. Fardell; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *Apr. 29*, 505.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. [Shropshire, Newport]
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 798–803.

Keogh Estate
Purchase of, proposed.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 284.

Kerry
Poor Law Unions—Salaries Paid to Medical Officers.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 853, 854.
Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, Progress made with.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 46, 47.

Keswick Urban District Council (Water) Bill
l. 2R.* *Apr. 24*, 1.

Kettle, Mr. T. M. [Tyrone, E.]
Dublin Metropolitan Police
Criminal Charges Manufactured by, *May 2*, 1113.
Rates Levied for Upkeep of, Exorbitant Nature of, *May 2*, 1109–1113.
Salaries and Allowances of, *May 2*, 1112.
Education
Intermediate
Facilities for Parliamentary Discussion, *May 2*, 1081.
Grants Paid and Number of Students Passing (1900–6), *May 1*, 848, 849, 889.
Secondary System, Necessity for Improving, *May 1*, 887.
Killeenan Postal Facilities, Improvement of, *Apr. 25*, 232.
Loughrey Manor, Acquisition of and Use for, *Apr. 25*, 254.
Roman Catholic University, Legislative Proposals for—Protests Received from Universities and Colleges, *Apr. 24*, 51, 52; *Apr. 25*, 284.

Kew Gardens
Cambridge Cottage, Utilisation of.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 2*, 1045.
Guide Books, etc., Right to Sell.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 2*, 1045.

Keyham Dockyard
See under Navy.

Kilbride, Mr. D. [Kildare, S.]
Kildare Grant, Information as to Deductions from, *Apr. 25*, 233.

Kildare
Grant, Information as to Deductions from.
Q. Mr. Kilbride; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 233, 234.

Killarney
Attack on Lord Kenmare's Bailiffs, on 27th April, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. Lonsdale, Sir B. Sheffield; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 885, 886.

Killarney Lake
Boats, Regulations for Licensing, etc.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 56.

Killeenan
Postal Facilities, Improvement of.
Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 25*, 232.

Killna Castle
Untenanted Lands, Purchase of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 870, 871.

Killorglin
Murphy, D., Inquiry into Case of.
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 46.

Kilmallock
Labourers' Cottages Applications, Complaints as to Rejection of.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 234.

Kilnsea and Easington
Seabank, Proposals for Re-construction of.
Q. Mr. A. S. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 30*, 697, 698.

Kiltyclogher
Reinstatement Claim of W. McGowan.
Q. Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 2*, 1051.

Kimber, Sir H. [Wandsworth]
Worthing Gas Bill, *Con.*, *Apr. 29*, 608–610.

King Edward's Hospital Fund for London Bill
l. 3R.* *Apr. 29*, 462.
c. 1R.* *Apr. 30*, 662.

King-Harman Estate
M'Drury, Holdings Purchased by.
Q. Mr. J. O'Kelly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 888.

King's County
Malicious Injury Cases, Cause and Number of—Cases Attributed to Vagrants.
Qs. Mr. H. Burke, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 48, 49.

Kingscourt
Post Office Extension, Circumstances of Building.
Q. Mr. S. Young; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 26*, 376.

Kinvara
Harbour Works, Progress made with.
Os. Mr. Duffy, *May 2*, 1138.

Knocklong
Labourers' Cottages Applications, Complaints as to Manner of dealing with.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 50, 51.

Labourers' Acts (Ireland)
Administration of, Delay in Erecting Cottages, Reason for Increase in Estimate, etc.
Os. Mr. Cherry, *May 2*, 1152–1154; Mr. Moore, 1154; Mr. Dillon, 1155; Mr. C. Craig, 1156; Mr. J. Campbell, 1157–1159; Mr. Birrell, 1160, 1161; Mr. T. L. Corbett, 1161, 1162.
Os. Sir H. Craik, *May 2*, 1162, 1163; Mr. O'Shaughnessy, 1163.

Labourers' Acts (Ireland)—*cont.*
Allotments Under, Granting Powers to District Councils, proposed.
Os. Mr. Ginnell, *May 2*, 1141, 1142; Mr. Power, 1142, 1143; Mr. Birrell, 1148; Mr. Cherry, 1152, 1153; Mr. Moore, 1154, 1155.

Cottages
Applicants, Rejected, Right of Complaint by.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 58.
Circumstances under which Erection is Sanctioned.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 500.

Funds, Effect on, of Deficiencies occasioned by Land Purchase Finance.
Q. Mr. C. Craig; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 2*, 1077.

Lamb, Mr. E. [Hereford, Leominster]
Great Northern and City Railway Bill, *Con.*, *May 6*, 1432.

Lamb, Mr. E. H. [Rochester]
Chatham Dockyard Extensions, Information as to, *Apr. 25*, 330, 331.
Great Northern and City Railway Bill, *Con.*, *May 6*, 1431.
Rosyth, Policy as to, *Apr. 25*, 330, 331.

Lambert, Mr. G.—*Lord of the Admiralty* [Devon, South Molton]
Admiral Superintendents at Ports, Policy as to Allowances to, for Purposes of Works, *Apr. 25*, 345.
Bermuda Naval Dockyard Extension, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 296.
Cape Colony—Simon's Bay Naval Dockyard, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 296, 337.
Chatham Barracks, Hospital, etc., Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 296.
Docking Accommodation for Large Vessels, *Apr. 25*, 296, 297.
Dover Harbour Works, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 296.
"Duke of Edinburgh," Circumstances of Grounding of, *Apr. 25*, 337.
Estimates, Works, Buildings, etc.—Transfer of Liabilities form Works Loan to the Vote, Policy of, *Apr. 25*, 294, 295, 300.
Expenditure Loan, Reduction in, *Apr. 25*, 295.
Gibraltar Naval Works, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 296.
Haulbowline Dock, Proposed Extension of, *Apr. 25*, 299, 300.
Hong Kong Dockyard and Coaling Facilities for the Navy, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 296.
Keyham Dockyard Extension, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 296.

[*cont.*

Lambert, Mr. G.—*cont.*

Malta Naval Works, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 296.

Osborne College

Epidemics at, Causes of—Sanitary Condition of the College, etc., *Apr. 25*, 297.

Hospital, Proposed Erection of, *Apr. 25*, 297.

Portsmouth Dockyards

Lock, New, Proposals as to Construction of, *Apr. 25*, 298, 336, 337.

Rate of Pay at, Payment of Trade Union Rates, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 336.

Portsmouth Factory, Explanation of Vote for, *Apr. 25*, 336.

Portland Naval Works and Buildings, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 296.

Rosyth—Policy as to, *Apr. 25*, 298, 299.

Shotley Hospital, Increase of Accommodation in, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 297.

Lambert Minors Estate

Sale Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Duffy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 2*, 1073.

Lambton, Mr. F. W. [Durham, S.E.]

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 564, 582–585.

Lamont, Mr. N. [Buteshire]

Plunkett, Sir H.—Offer of Position of Scottish Agricultural Commissioner, proposed, *Apr. 29*, 540.

Lamphier Estate

Reinstatement Claims of P. Cormack and J. Feehan.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 26*, 383.

Lanarkshire

Illegitimacy, Statistics as to.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 29*, 540.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Bill

Board of Trade Report Presented, *Apr. 24*, 5.

Lancaster, Duchy of

Chancellor—Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. Fowler.

Land

Government Policy in England.
Q. Viscount Helmsley; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 29*, 547.

Small Holdings, *see that title.*

Transfer, Sales and Mortgages, Costs incurred in England and Wales—Return proposed.
Qs. Mr. G. Greenwood; Colonel Herbert; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 2*, 1080, 1081.

Land Act, 1903

Guarantee Fund, Sums drawn from and repaid to since 1903.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 2*, 1040, 1041.

Section 54, Effect of, on Borrowing powers of Purchasers.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Cherry, *Apr. 25*, 242, 243.

Transactions, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 515, 516.

Treasury Rules, Amendments proposed to be made in.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 2*, 1041, 1043.

Land Commission (Ireland)

[*See also* names of places and estates.]

Clerks, Classification, Salaries and duties of.
Qs. Mr. Field; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 851, 853.

Pink Schedule, Information recorded in.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 870.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill

c. Rep.* *Apr. 25*, 228.
3R.* *Apr. 26*, 373.
l. 1R.* *Apr. 29*, 462.

Land Drainage Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill

c. Rep.* *Apr. 25*, 228.
3R.* *Apr. 26*, 373.
l. 1R.* *Apr. 29*, 462.

Land Purchase, Ireland

[*See also* names of places, estates, etc.]

Financial Working, Inquiry into, or opportunity for Discussion, proposed.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 24*, 64.
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond; Mr. A. J. Balfour; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 24*, 67, 68.

Funds

Amount Lying in Banks without Interest.
Qs. Mr. Hayden, Captain Craig, Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 24*, 64–67.

Bank, Authorised to receive Moneys.
Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 30*, 675, 676.

Condition of, and Balance Remaining in Hand.
Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 56, 57.

[*cont.*

Land Purchase, Ireland—*cont.*
  Funds—*cont.*
    Deficiencies in—Expenditure of sum paid from Development Grant.
      Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 2,* 1043.
  Guaranteed Stock, Post Office Facilities for Purchase, etc.
      Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 24,* 28, 29.
  Inspectors, System of Allocating to Districts
      Qs. Mr. Flynn; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 47.
  Proceedings, Expediting of, proposed.
      Qs. Captain Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1,* 876.
  Report of Estates Commissioners, Date of Presenting.
      Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1,* 871.
  Stock
    Amount issued to 31st March, 1907.
      Q. Mr. John O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 2,* 1043.
    Loss of £102,000, Information as to.
      Q. Mr. Mooney; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 29,* 544.
    Regulations as to Payment of Interest.
      Q. Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 29,* 542, 543.
    Sinking Fund Applicable to Redemption of.
      Q. Mr. O'Mara; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 1,* 847, 848.
  Transactions in course of being dealt with
      Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 58.
  Uneconomic Holdings, means of Paying Rent on and Application of Rule in Blake-Foster case to purchase of.
      Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 1,* 892.

Land Purchase (Ireland) Act, 1891
  Section 2, Proposals for making Rules under.
      Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 26,* 375.

Land Valuation (Scotland) Bill
  Date of Introducing.
      Q. Mr. C. E. Price; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6,* 1360.

Lane-Fox, Mr. G. [Yorks, W.R., Barkston Ash]
  Small Holdings, Acquisition of Land for—Official Evidence of Difficulty Experienced in, *Apr. 24,* 10, 70.

Lansdowne, Marquess of
  Companies Bill, *Com., May 2,* 1000.
  Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29,* 478.

Lansdowne, Marquess of—*cont.*
  Small Holdings
    Demand for, Substantiation of—Allegations as to Attitude of Landowners, etc., proposed, *Apr. 25,* 186, 190–193, 218.
    Experiments made by Earl Carrington, Statements as to, proposed, *Apr. 25,* 192–194.
    Official Returns — Tabling fuller Information, proposed, *Apr. 25,* 190, 219.
    Papers Relating to, Date of Tabling, *May 2,* 995.
    Report and Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 25,* 191, 192.
    Speech by Prime Minister at Holborn Restaurant, Terms of, *Apr. 25,* 185–190, 210, 212, 218.

Law, Mr. H. A. [Donegal, W.]
  Dredgers, Regulations as to Provision of, *May 2,* 1123, 1127.
  National School Teachers' Salaries, Incidence of Paying, *May 1,* 855.

Law Courts
  Ireland—Supreme Court of Judicature—Interest on Securities held on behalf of Suitors.
      Q. Mr. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 30,* 713.
  Scotland—Reduction in Time for Appeals from Court of Session to House of Lords, proposed.
      Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *Apr. 24,* 42, 43.

Lea, Mr. H. C. [St. Pancras, E.]
  Africa, East—Charge Against Captain Grogan, etc., *May 6,* 1334.
  Army
    Courts Martial During 1905–6, *Apr. 29,* 519.
    Soldiers
      Inducements to Obtain Education Certificates, *Apr. 29,* 520.
      Number Sentenced to Penal Servitude in 1906, *Apr. 29,* 494, 519.
  British Museum Reading Room, Redecoration of—Method of Calling for Tenders, *Apr. 25,* 281.
  London Municipal Society—Subscription to, by London and North Western Railway, *Apr. 25,* 355–357.
  London and North Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25,* 355–357, 360.
  Paisley—Identity of Workmen Employed in Alterations to Licensed Premises, *Apr. 29,* 540.
  Portsmouth Harbour Entrance, Proposals for Widening, *Apr. 25,* 335.

[*cont.*

Lea, Mr. H. C.—*cont.*
Portsmouth, Earl of—Allegations as to Harsh Treatment of Tenant, *Apr. 29*, 538, ; *May 1*, 892, 894, 895 ; *May 6*, 1361.
Railways
Passengers, Measures for Protecting from Bad Characters attending Race Meetings, *Apr. 29*, 531.
Subscription to Party Organisations, Prohibition of—Legislative Proposals, *Apr. 25*, 357.

Leader Estate
Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. A. Connell.
Q. Mr. Sheehan ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30*, 670.

Lee, Mr. A. H. [Hampshire, Fareham]
Army
Artillery—Cost under Present System and under New Scheme, *Apr. 24*, 19.
Sandhurst Cadets, Cause for Delay in Gazetting, *May 1*, 864.
Second Line—Camp Training, Period for and Cost of Allowance, *May 6*, 1329.
Chatham—Groyne at Hooness, Reason for Abandoning Construction of, *Apr. 25*, 344.
Colonial Conference, 1907, Preference Resolutions—Publication and Tabling of Speeches, *May 6*, 1358.
Militia Training—Reason for Abandonment of Shooting Instruction for Garrison Artillery, *Apr. 29*, 523.
Navy
Admiral Superintendents at Ports, Policy as to Allowances to, for Purposes of Works, *Apr. 25*, 345.
Home Fleet, Base for, Information as to, *Apr. 25*, 306.
Portsmouth Dockyard Lock, New, Proposals as to Construction of, *Apr. 25*, 306–308, 312.
Rosyth
Policy as to, *Apr. 25*, 303–305, 317, 338.
Staff Employed at, *Apr. 24*, 31.
Navy Estimates for Works, Buildings, etc. —Transfer of Liabilities from Works Loans to the Vote, Policy of, *Apr. 25*, 300–303, 317.

Leeds
Elementary Schools, Teaching of Music in.
Q. Mr. O'Grady ; *A.* Mr. Lough, *May 2*, 1068.

Lehmann, Mr. R. C. [Leicester, Market Harborough]
Parliament Street Post Office, Sentence on J. Baines for Theft of Ink-pot from, *Apr. 29*, 506.

Leith of Fyvie, Lord
Companies Bill, *Com.*, *May 2*, 999.
Navy
Nucleus Crews, Working of System, *May 1*, 839.
Repairs—Statement as to State of Ships of the Fleet in January 1905 and 1907, proposed, *May 1*, 839.
Rosyth, Policy as to, *May 1*, 840.

Lerwick
Telegraph Staff, Allowance to, for Knowledge of Danish proposed.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 6*, 1351.

Lettermore
Distress Committee, Constitution of.
Q. Mr. O'Malley ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 2*, 1074.

Levy, Mr. M. [Leicestershire, Loughborough]
Australian Commerce Act, Use of, to place British Imports at a Disadvantage, alleged, *Apr. 24*, 32.

Lewisham
Schools Rifle Association, Information as to.
Q. Mr. Byles ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 6*, 1309.

Licensing (Scotland) Act, 1903
Section 106—Qualification of Clerk to Justice of Peace Court to act as Solicitor in Burgh Court.
Q. Mr. Cleland ; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *May 6*, 1308.

Lights and Lighthouses
Irish Lights Board, Luncheon Allowance of.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh, Mr. Flavin ; *As.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 24*, 37, 38.

Lights on Vehicles Bill
c. *Rep.* Apr. 25*, 293.

Limited Partnerships Bill
c. 2R., *May 3*, 1191.

Liquor Traffic
Legislation, Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Fetherstonhaugh ; *A*, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 25*, 255, 256.
London County Compensation Fund, Information as to.
Qs. Mr. Remnant ; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Speaker, *May 6*, 1348, 1349.
Reform Proposals.
Qs. Mr. V. Cavendish, *Apr. 24*, 93.

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill
c. 1R., *Apr. 26*, 386.
Debate on Second Reading [Commons], *Apr. 24*, 386.
Clubs, Increase in Number of, 400, 401, 403.
Compensation for Licences cancelled, Absence of Provision for, 401, 402, 405, 406, 408–410, 412, 413, 416, 436, 437.
Date of coming into Operation, 390.
Disinterested Management, Alleged Failure of Expermients in, 419, 426–429.
Drunkenness, Statistics as to, 387, 430, 432.
Extension of Principle to England, Possibility of, 394.
Government Attitude towards the Bill, 394, 404, 434, 435.
Poll, Provisions for taking, 389.
Prohibition Laws in the United States, Working of, 397, 398, 399, 405, 413–415, 425.
Public Opinion in Favour of Local Option. 388, 391, 397, 417, 418, 419, 424, 431, 438–442.
Sunday Closing and Early Closing, Success of Measures, 407.

Lisevine
Reinstatement Claim of J. Barry.
Q. Mr. Crean; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 881, 882.

Liverpool
Dock Regulations, Breaches of, by certain Ships—Action proposed to be taken.
Q. Mr. C. Duncan; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 25*, 242.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*The President of the Board of Trade* [Carnarvon Boroughs]
Canadian Iron and Steel Manufactures, Import of—New Tariff on British Goods, *Apr. 29*, 492.
Coffee—Legalised Vegetable Adulterants introduced in 1906, *Apr. 30*, 674.
Companies, Limited, in Foreign Countries, Compulsory Reserve Fund for, *Apr. 30*, 673.
Exports and Imports
Arms and Ammunition imported in 1905—Amount of Naval and Military Stores, etc., *Apr. 24*, 34.
Classification of Raw Materials and Manufactured Articles in Returns, System of, *Apr. 24*, 35.

Lloyd-George, Rt. Hon. D.—*cont.*
Exports and Imports—*cont.*
Colonies and India, Statistics as to Trade with, during 1906, *Apr. 30*. 674.
Prices of 1900, Return based on—Reason for Choice of Year, *Apr. 25*, 245.
Relative Average Prices in 1900 and 1906, *Apr. 25*, 245.
Irish Lights Board, Luncheon Allowance of, *Apr. 24*, 37, 38.
"Jebba," Wreck of—Awards for saving Passengers, etc., *Apr. 24*, 37.
Kilnsea and Easington — Proposals for reconstruction of Seabank, *Apr. 30*, 698.
London and North Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 349–352.
Meat Importation, Proposals for regulating, *Apr. 24*, 36.
Merchant Shipping Conference — Measures for counteracting German attempts to capture Carrying Trade with New York, *Apr. 30*, 698.
Railway
Luggage of Passengers — Amount paid in Insurance and Number of Claims during last Five Years, *Apr. 25*, 244.
Rates on Conveyance of Fruit and Vegetables, *Apr. 30*, 697.
Subscriptions to Party Organisations
Prohibition of — Legislative Proposals, *Apr. 25*, 351.
Schedules of Accounts to give Details of, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 350, 351.

Local Authorities
Women serving on, Legislative Proposals to authorise.
Q. Mr. Myer; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 2*, 1079.
Workmen's Compensation Act, Application of, to Employees.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 2*, 1047.

Local Authorities (Taxation and Purchase of Land) Bill
c. 1R.* *May 3*, 1087.

Local Government Board
President—Rt. Hon. J. Burns.
Parliamentary Secretary —Dr. Macnamara.

Local Government Board (Ireland)
Expenditure by, Increase in Estimate, etc.
Os. Mr. Ginnell, *May* 2, 1140; Mr. Barrie, 1150, 1151; Mr. Cherry, 1154; Mr. J. Campbell, 1157; Mr. Birrell, 1160.

[*cont*,

Local Government Board (Ireland)—*cont.*
  Inspectors
    Temporary, Increase in Estimate for.
      Os. Mr. Barrie, *May 2,* 1151; Mr. Cherry, 1154.
    Women Inspectors, Employment of Permanently, proposed.
      Os. Mr. Barrie, *May 2,* 1151.
  Tenders — Surcharges on Boards of Guardians, Objections to System of.
    Os. Mr. Boland, *May 2,* 1144–1147; Mr. Birrell, 1148, 1149; Mr. Barrie, 1150; Mr. J. Campbell, 1159, 1160.
  Vote for, *May 2,* 1139.

Local Government Board (Scotland)
  Report (1906), Presented, *May 6,* 1202, 1300.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders Bill
  l. 1R.* *May 2,* 995.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill
  l. 2R.* *Apr. 25,* 178.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill
  l. 2R.* *May 6,* 1202.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 5) Bill
  c. 1R.* *May 3,* 1165.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill
  c. 1R.* *May 3,* 1165.

Local Taxation
  See Taxation, Local.

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. [Essex, Epping]
  Finance Act, 1894—Reason for Non-application of Section 20 to the Transvaal, *Apr. 29,* 503.
  Free Labour Association, Allegations as to Payment made to by London and North Western Railway, *Apr. 25,* 352, 354.
  London Municipal Society, Subscription to, by London and North Western Railway, *Apr. 25,* 368.
  London and North Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25,* 352, 354, 368.
  War Taxes, Reasons for continuing as a Permanent Charge, *May 1,* 936.

London
  Ambulances for Street Accidents, Provision of—Date of Issue of Committee Report.
    Q. Dr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 24,* 16.

London—*cont.*
  Drainage, Combined, Cost of maintaining—Amendment of Law, proposed.
    Q. Mr. T. Davies; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 30,* 700.

London County Council (Money) Bill
  c. 2R.* *Apr. 30,* 661.

London County Council (Tramways and Improvements) Bill
  c. *Rep.** *Apr. 29,* 488.
    3R.* *May 6,* 1299.

London Government Scheme (Southwark Borough) Market Bill
  l. *Rep.** *Apr. 30,* 629.
    Com. and *Rep.** *May 1,* 821.
    3R.* *May 2,* 994.

London Municipal Society
  London and North Western Railway Subscription to.
    Os. Mr. Trevelyan, *Apr. 25,* 354, 355; Mr. Lea, 355–357; Mr. Micklem, 360–363; Mr. Bright, 363, 364; Mr. Hemmerde, 364, 365; Mr. Kearley, 366; Mr. Herbert, 367; Mr Straus, 368; Colonel Lockwood, 368; Sir W. J. Collins, 369; Mr. Verney, 370.

London Port and Docks Bill
  c. Bill withdrawn, *Apr. 25,* 228.

London and North Western Railway Bill
  c. 2R.* *Apr. 25,* 349.

London and North Western Railway (Superannuation Fund) Bill
  c. *Con.** *Apr. 25,* 345.
    3R.* *Apr. 29,* 487.
  l. 1R.* *Apr. 30,* 630.

London Traffic Commission
  See Street Traffic.

Londonderry, Marquess of
  Small Holdings
    Demand for—Substantiation of Allegations as to Attitude of Landowners, *Apr. 25,* 210–213.
    Official Returns as to—Tabling fuller Information, proposed, *Apr. 25,* 211.

Long, Mr. W. H. [Dublin, S.]
  Agriculture Department, Working of, Inquiry into—Publication of Minutes of Evidence, proposed, *May 1,* 887.
  Portsmouth, Earl of—Allegations as to Harsh Treatment of Tenant, *May 1,* 894.
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29,* 571–577.

Longfield Estate

Lehane, D., Decision in Case of.
Q. Mr. Flynn; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 253.

Longford

County Council Grant, Deductions from.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 884, 885.

Longford Pass

Reinstatement Claims of M. Morris and E. Kealy.
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6*, 1305.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B. [Armagh, Mid.]

Administration, Legislative Proposals as to, *Apr. 24*, 56.

Agriculture Department

Plunkett, Sir H., Resignation of Office by, *Apr. 29*, 546.

Working of—Date of Presenting Report of Inquiry, *Apr. 24*, 54.

Argentina—Tax on Commercial Travellers, *Apr. 29*, 535.

Ballina Dispensary District—Conditions of Appointment of Dr. J. Clarke, *Apr. 24*, 60.

Ballintubber — Hostile Demonstrations against Mr. Payne, *May 1*, 875, 876.

Colonial Conference Proceedings, Decision as to Publication of, *Apr. 29*, 546.

Court of Criminal Appeal Bill, Proposals for extending to Ireland, *May 2*, 1072.

Crannagh Farm Tenants, Present Position of, *Apr. 24*, 59.

Edenderry Poor Law Guardians—Circumstances of accepting Tenders for Drugs, *Apr. 24*, 54.

Elphin Disturbance of April 14th—Measures taken to preserve Peace, etc., *May 1*, 873.

India—Lahore Disturbances—Government Support to Repressive Measures, *May 6*, 1311.

Killarney—Attack on Lord Kenmare's Bailiffs on 27th April, *May 1*, 885.

King's County, Malicious Injury Cases, Cause and Number of—Cases attributed to Vagrants, *Apr. 24*, 48.

Land Purchase Funds—Amount lying in Banks without Interest, *Apr. 24*, 67.

Murphy, D., and Mr. O'Sullivan, Cases of, *Apr. 24*, 46.

New Hebrides—Arms and Spirits, Regulation of Traffic in, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 32

Old-age Pensions, Calculations as to Number of Persons benefiting under Scheme starting on £2,250,000, *Apr. 25*, 269.

Orange River Colony—Position of British Settlers, *May 6*, 1344.

Lonsdale, Mr. J. B.—*cont.*

Persia, Progress of Anglo-Russian Negotiations as to, *Apr. 25*, 268.

Portsmouth, Earl of—Allegations as to Harsh Treatment of Tenant, *Apr. 29*, 539.

Roman Catholic University, Legislative Proposals for—Protests received from Universities and Colleges, *Apr. 24*, 52.

Roscommon, Intimidatory Processions in—Police Instructions, *May 1*, 874.

St. Lucia Riots, Information as to, *Apr. 29*, 528.

Skibbereen—Election of Drimoleague Dispensary Doctor, *May 1*, 879.

Soudan—Date of Congolese Evacuation of Bahr-el-Ghazel, *Apr. 25*, 264.

Tongalee—Case of Mr. Beirne, *Apr. 24*, 53.

Turkish Customs Duties—Position of Negotiations, *Apr. 25*, 263; *Apr. 29*, 530.

Lord Advocate *v.* Col. Balfour

Government Acquiescence in Decision.
Q. Mr. J. C. Wason; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *May 6*, 1308.

Lord Advocate for Scotland

Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.

Lord Chamberlain

Viscount Althorp.

Minister Responsible to the House for Action or Inaction of.
Q. Mr. V. Kennedy; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1348.

Lord Chancellor

Lord Loreburn.

Lord Chief Justice

Lord Alverstone.

Lord Great Chamberlain

Marquess of Cholmondeley.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland

Earl of Aberdeen.

Lord President of the Council

Earl of Crewe.

Lord Privy Seal

Marquess of Ripon.

Loreburn, Lord—*Lord Chancellor.*

Appeals—Amendment of Standing Orders relating to, *May 6*, 1295.

Companies Bill, *Com.*, *May 2*, 1000, 1006, 1010, 1014, 1016, 1019, 1023, 1027, 1029, 1030, 1032.

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 478.

Lough, Mr.—*Parliamentary Secretary, Board of Education* [Islington, W.]
  Halsall Charity, New Scheme, Date of Publication, *Apr. 24*, 39, 40.
  Leeds Elementary Schools, Teaching of Music in, *May 2*, 1068.

Loughry Manor
  Acquisition of and use for, by Agriculture Department.
    Q. Mr. Kettle; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 254.

Low Estate
  Sale Proposals for—Cause for Procedure taken.
    Q. Mr. Crean; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 872, 873.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W. [Cumberland, Penrith]
  Rulings, *see under titles* Questions and Speaker.

Lucas Peerage
  Report Presented, *Apr. 25*, 177.

Lunacy
  Grant under Local Government Act—Extension to Workhouse Patients proposed.
    Q. Mr. W. Pearce; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 2*, 1049.
  Ireland—Expenditure on Asylums in 1906.
    Qs. Mr. Joyce; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30*, 709, 710.

Lupton, Mr. A. [Lincolnshire, Sleaford]
  Channel Tunnel Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 348.
  "Defiance," H.M.S., Smallpox Case in—Date of Vaccination of Patient, *Apr. 30*, 676.
  Germany, Origin of Vaccine Lymph used in, *Apr. 30*, 698, 699.
  Income Tax — Definition of Income derived from wasting Security as earned or unearned, *Apr. 30*, 676.
  Transvaal Chinese Labour—Circumstances of admitting unlicensed Coolies, *May 6*, 1343.
  Vaccination
    Order, Cause for Delay in Issue of, *Apr. 29*, 507.
    Reeves, G., Prosecution Case of, *Apr. 30*, 696, 967.
  Vaccination Bill, Date of Presenting, *Apr. 30*, 699.

Lyttelton, Rt. Hon. A. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
  Colonial Conference, 1907—Arrangements for Publishing Proceedings, *Apr. 25*, 262.

Lytton, Earl of
  Phosphorus Poisoning
    Moreland & Co., Messrs., Fatal Case at Factory of, *Apr. 25*, 179.
    Prohibition of use of White and Yellow Phosphorus in Match Industry—Reconsideration of Attitude towards Convention of Berne, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 179–184.

McCallum, Mr. [Paisley]
  India—Bengal Education Staff, Information as to, *Apr. 25*, 259.

McCrae, Mr. G. [Edinburgh, E.]
  Income Tax
    Collection—Assimilating System to that Prevailing in Scotland, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 99.
    Earned Incomes up to £2,000 to be Taxed at 9d. in the £, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 98.
    Returns
      Compulsory filling up of Forms, Proposals as to, *Apr. 24*, 98, 99.
      Employers to give Particulars of all Salaries paid, *Apr. 24*, 99.
  National Debt—New Sinking Fund, Addition to, out of Surplus Revenue, *Apr. 24*, 97.
  Old Age Pensions—Government Proposal, *Apr. 24*, 101.

Macdonald, Mr. J. A. M. [Falkirk Burghs]
  Navy Estimates—Date of Taking Vote 8, *May 2*, 1078.
  Railways—Deposit of Lancashire and Yorkshire Company Agreement with London and North Western, *May 2*, 1064.
  Universities—Inquiry into Finances, Government, etc., proposed, *May 6*, 1357.

MacDonald, Mr. J. R. [Leicester]
  Aberdeenshire—Cause for Extension of Sporting Ground on Estates of Mr. Heaven and Mr. Coats, *May 6*, 1352.
  Congo Free State Baptist Mission, Complaints by, *May 6*, 1345.
  Education, Secondary Endowments—Publication of Information in Possession of the Board, *Apr. 29*, 535.
  Factories
    Inspectors, Assistant, Duties of, *Apr. 29*, 532.
    Young Persons, Employment of—Measures taken to give Publicity to Order No. 680, *Apr. 29*, 531.
  Harrow School, Cost of Upkeep of, *Apr. 29*, 506.

[*cont.*

Macdonald, Mr. J. R.—*cont.*
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill
    Allocation of Time to Various Stages, proposals as to, *May 6*, 1394–1396.
    Amendments, Effect of Guillotine Resolution on, *May 6*, 1394.
  Transvaal Chinese Labour—Circumstances of Admitting Unlicensed Coolies, *May 6*, 1343.

McHugh, Mr. P. A. [Sligo, N.]
  Cork Grants—Deductions from, in respect of Land Purchase, *Apr. 30*, 665, 706.
  County and Borough Council Grants, Deductions from in respect of Land Purchase, *Apr. 30*, 665, 706.
  Eviction Cases of C. Mullen and C. McDonagh, Patients in Sligo Asylum, *May 1*, 871.
  Law Courts—Interest on Securities held on behalf of Suitors in Supreme Court, *Apr. 30*, 713.
  Mullaghmore Fish-curing Station, Decision as to Establishing, *Apr. 29*, 511.
  Sligo Grants, Deductions from, in respect of Land Purchase, *Apr. 30*, 663, 667, 706, *May 1*, 890.
  Wexford Grant, Deductions from, in respect of Land Purchase, *Apr. 30*, 665, 706.

Mackarness, Mr. F. C. [Berkshire, Newbury]
  Transvaal Chinese Labour—Unlicensed Coolies, Circumstances of Admitting, *May 6*, 1337, 1338.

McKean, Mr. J. [Monaghan, S.]
  Dublin Metropolitan Police Duties, Extension of, proposed, *May 2*, 1098–1102.

McKenna, Mr. R.—*President Board of Education* [Monmouth, N.]
  Agriculture Classes Assisted by Board of Education, *Apr. 25*, 274.
  Education Act, 1870—Effect of Repeal of Section 16, *Apr. 30*, 704.
  Education (Administrative Provisions) Bill, Clause 10—Expert Opinion on which Drafted, *May 6*, 1310.
  Glamorganshire Schools, Reason for Increase in Cost of Maintaining, *Apr. 25*, 275, 276.
  Harrow School, Cost of Upkeep of, *Apr. 29*, 506.
  Hartlepool—Teaching of Rifle-Shooting at Halley's Field Upper School, *Apr. 30*, 702.
  Lewisham Schools Rifle Association, Information as to, *May 6*, 1309.
  Military Instruction in Schools, Decision as to, *May 6*, 1309.
  Ramsgate—Rooms in Use at St. George's and Ellington Schools, *Apr. 25*, 230.

McKenna, Mr. R.—*cont.*
  Schools
    Designation of, in New Official List, *Apr. 30*, 702, 703.
    Expenditure of Public Money on Erecting—Legislative proposals, *May 6*, 1310.
  Secondary Education Endowments—Publication of Information in Possession of the Board, *Apr. 29*, 535.
  Teachers
    Foreign Languages, Number sent Abroad to Train in, *Apr. 30*, 701.

MacLean, Mr. D. [Bath]
  Teachers sent Abroad to Train in Foreign Languages, *Apr. 30*, 701.

Macnamara, Dr. T. J.—*The Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board* [Camberwell, N.]
  Motors, Legislative Proposals for dealing with, *May 6*, 1309.

MacNeill, Mr. J. G. S. [Donegal, S.]
  Colonial Parliamentary System—Inquiry into Reason for Omission of Chamber of Hereditary and Spiritual Members, proposed, *May 2*, 1080.
  Condition of Ireland, Statements in Appeal by Lord Ashtown, *May 2*, 1076.

Maconchey Estate
  Turbary Trustee—Reason for Removal of Mr. M'Kiernan.
    Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 884.

MacVeagh, Mr. J. [Down, S.]
  Agriculture Department
    Grants, Endowment, etc., Information as to, *Apr. 24*, 61.
    Travelling Veterinary Inspector, Proposals for appointing, *May 1*, 855.
  Belfast Operatives, Wages of, *Apr. 29*, 493.
  Condition of Ireland—Statements in Appeal by Lord Ashtown, *May 2*, 1076.
  Constabulary Inspectors and Head Constables, Number and Religion of, *May 3*, 1170.
  Dublin Valuation Office, Promotion System in, *Apr. 26*, 379, 381.
  Houses in each Province of Ireland valued at £2 or less, *May 3*, 1170.
  Income-Tax—Reason for Refusal of Payment of Interest to Messrs. Swinburne, Green & Herron, *Apr. 29*, 536.
  Income-Tax—Issue of Statement as to Collection in Ireland, proposed, *Apr. 26*, 376.
  Irish Lights Board, Luncheon Allowance of, *Apr. 24*, 37, 38.

[*cont.*

MacVeagh, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Land Purchase Funds—Amount lying in Banks without Interest, *Apr. 24,* 66.
  Magistrates, Resident, Names, Ages, etc., of, *May 3,* 1166.
  Postal Facilities for Transmission of Christmas Supplements, *May 6,* 1303.
  Religious Persuasion of Irish Officials, *May 3,* 1169.
  Ulster Population—Decrease since 1841, *Apr. 26,* 382.
  Valuation of Ireland per Inhabitant, per County, *Apr. 26,* 376.

Macedonia
  Condition of Vilayets, Reports received on.
    Q. Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25,* 263.

Magistrates
  Ireland—Names, Ages, Religions, and Salaries of Resident Magistrates.
    Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 3,* 1166, 1167.
  Poor Law Guardians, Adjudication by, in Poor Law Cases.
    Q. Mr. Brunner; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 29,* 505.

Magnus, Sir P. [London University]
  Army—Sandhurst Cadets, Cause for Delay in Gazetting, *May 1,* 864.
  Vivisection Commission Report, Date of Presenting, *May 1,* 868.

Maidstone Gas Bill
  l. 2R.* *Apr. 24,* 1.

Malta
  Naval Works, Expenditure on.
    Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25,* 296; Mr. Bellairs, 320.

Manchester Corporation Tramways Bill
  c. 2R.* *May 6,* 1299.

Manchester Ship Canal (Bridgewater Canal) Bill
  c. 2R.* *Apr. 29,* 488.

Marines, Royal
  Officers
    Average Age of Specialisation under New Scheme.
      Q. Mr. G. Greenwood; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 2,* 1052.
    New Regulations as to.
      Q. Mr. G. Greenwood; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 30,* 682, 683.

Markham, Mr. A. B. [Nottinghamshire, Mansfield]
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Allocation of Time to various Stages, Proposals as to, *May 6,* 1415, 1416.

Marks, Mr. H. H. [Kent, Thanet]
  Crown Lands Agency, Reason for Changes in, *Apr. 24,* 40.

Mason, Mr. J. F. [Windsor]
  Income Tax—Earned incomes up to £2,000 to be Taxed at Ninepence in the Pound, proposed, *Apr. 24,* 102.
  Old-Age Pensions—Government Proposals, *Apr. 24,* 103.
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30,* 791–794.
  Taxation, Local—Assigned Revenue Intercepted from the Treasury, Abolition of System, *Apr. 24,* 103.
  Tea Duty, Reduction of, to Fourpence per Pound, proposed, *May 1,* 911.
  War Taxes, Possibility of Remitting, *Apr. 24,* 102.

Match Trade
  Phosphorus Poisoning, *see that title.*

Meagher, Mr. M. [Kilkenny, N.]
  Gawran—Case of T. Gaffney, *Apr. 25,* 284, 285.
  Poor Law Returns for 1906, Payment for Work entailed in Preparing, proposed, *Apr. 30,* 700.
  Wandesforde Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 30,* 710.

Meat
  Importation, Proposals for Regulating.
    Q. Sir W. Bull; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 24,* 36.
  Imports from Argentina and United States in 1906.
    Q. Sir W. Bull; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *May 1,* 857.

Merchant Shipping
  [*For* particular vessels *see their names.*]
  Colonial Conference
    Constitution of—Reason for Disallowing Representation of Merchant Service Guild.
      Os. Lord Muskerry, *Apr. 30,* 657–659; Earl of Granard, 659, 660.
    German Attempts to Capture Colonial Carrying Trade with New York, Measures for Counteracting.
      Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 30,* 698.
  Seamen, Deceased, Estates of—Exchange of Notes With Germany, Presented, *May 2,* 995, 1035.

Merchant Shipping Acts Amendment Bill
  l. 1R.* *Apr. 29,* 464.

Mesopotamia

Oil Deposits, Concession of.

Qs. Mr. Bowles; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 265.

Metropolitan Railway [Pension Fund] Bill

l. Rep. Apr. 30*, 629.

3R.* *May 6*, 1201.

Meysey-Thompson, Mr. E. C. [Stafford, Handsworth]

Dowra Disturbance of 19th February—Reason for Discharge of Accused Persons, *Apr. 24*, 62.

Micklem, Mr. N. [Herts, Watford]

London Municipal Society, Subscription to by London and North Western Railway, *Apr. 25*, 360–363.

London and North Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 360, 363.

Middlesbrough Corporation Bill

c. 2R.* *Apr. 29*, 488.

"Mikado"

Naval and Marine Bands, Reason for Prohibition of Performance by.

Qs. Mr. Trevelyan, Viscount Turnour, Mr G. Faber, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 6*, 1323, 1324.

Withdrawal of Licence, Reason for—Representations Received from Japan. etc.

Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 29*, 529, 530.

Qs. Mr. V. Kennedy; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *May 2*, 1062.

Qs. Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. G. Faber, Mr. P. Pease; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 6*, 1346–1348.

Mildmay, Mr. F. B. [Devon, Totnes]

Bills—Resolutions dealing with Allocation of Time for Particular Bills, Inexpediency of, *May 6*, 1399.

"Jebba" Wreck of—Awards for Saving Passengers, etc., *Apr. 24*, 36.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Allocation of Time to Various Stages, *May 6*, 1399–1402.

Military Instruction in Schools

Decision of the Education Department as to.

Q. Mr. Byles; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *May 6*, 1309.

Militia

Artillery Garrison

Gun Ammunition to be Issued for Training.

Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 25*, 235, 236; *May 2*, 1054.

Militia—*cont.*

Artillery Garrison—*cont.*

Gun Ammunition, etc.—*cont.*

Reason for Abandonment of Shooting Instruction for.

Qs. Mr. Fell, Mr. A. Lee, Maj. Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29*, 523.

Reserve, Proposals as to, under New Scheme.

Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6*, 1306.

Terms of Service, Effect of Territorial and Reserve Forces on, Bill.

Q. Lord J. Joicey-Cecil; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29*, 502.

Mines

Hours of Labour, Legislative Proposals for shortening.

Q. Mr. Glover; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 29*, 505.

Operations under the Sea, Crown Leases Required for.

Q. Mr. G. Roberts; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 50*, 704.

Mitcham and Wimbledon District Gas Bill

l. 2R.* *Apr. 24*, 1.

Rep. Apr. 30*, 629.

Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. W. [Lanarkshire, N.W.]

Coastguard

Inquiry, Information as to, *May 1*, 863.

Number of Men affected by Closing of Stations, *May 1*, 862, 863.

Pacific Islanders Act—Proposals for Amendment, *May 6*, 1362.

St. Lucia Riots, Information as to, *Apr. 29*, 528.

British Warships within Two Days' Steam of the Island, *Apr. 29*, 498.

Scots Greys—Date of leaving Scotland, *May 6*, 1329.

Sheriff Court Civil Procedure Bill—Date of taking Second Reading, *Apr. 25*, 256.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 734–742.

Spirits—Basis of calculating Estimate of Cost to Distillers of Revenue Restrictions, *Apr. 29*, 508.

Transvaal Chinese Labour, Repatriation of, *May 6*, 1335.

Mond, Mr. A. [Chester]

Dover Harbour Works, Expenditure on, *Apr. 25*, 313.

Exports and Imports

Arms and Ammunition imported in 1905—Amount of Naval and Military Stores, etc., *Apr. 24*, 34.

Classification of Raw Materials and Manufactured Articles in Returns, System of, *Apr. 24*, 34.

[*cont.*

Mond, Mr. A.—*cont.*
- Navy Estimate for Works, Buildings, etc.—Transfer of Liabilities from Works Loan to the Vote, Policy of, *Apr. 25*, 313.
- Portsmouth Dockyards—Lock, New, Proposals as to Construction, *Apr. 25*, 312.

Money, Mr. L. G. Chiozza [Paddington, N.]
- Committees, Standing—Allegations as to Laxity of Attendance of Members, *May 2*, 1079.
- Death Duties—Revision, Proposals as to, *Apr. 24*, 118.
- Income-Tax
  - Earned Incomes up to £2,000 to be Taxed at 9d. in the £, *Apr. 24*, 115.
  - Returns—Employers to give Particulars of all Salaries paid, *Apr. 24*, 116.
- National Debt—Reduction, Provision for, *Apr. 24*, 113, 114.
- Old-Age Pensions—Government Proposals, *Apr. 24*, 118, 119.
- Paddington Borough Council, Home-Workers employed by—Reason for Refusal to Supply Addresses, *May 2*, 1063.
- Sugar Duty, Revenue derived from, and Proposals as to, *Apr. 24*, 118.
- Taxation Indirect, Incidence of, *Apr. 24*, 114, 115.

Monk Bretton, Lord
- Training Colleges, Hostels in connection With—Regulations as to Grants-in-Aid, *Apr. 25*, 222–224.

Money-Lenders Act, 1900
- Amendment, Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Carr-Gomm; *A.* Sir J. Walton, *May 6*, 1302.

Montagu of Beaulieu, Lord
- House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1290–1294.

Mooney, Mr. T. J. [Newry]
- Agriculture Department, Vice-President
  - Office to be a Ministerial and Parliamentary one, and to be vacated on a Change of Government, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 140–144.
  - Plunkett, Sir H., Reasons for Retention in Office—Local Opinion in Ireland etc., *Apr. 24*, 140–144.
- Land Purchase
  - Fund, Deficiencies in—Expenditure of Sum paid from Development Grant, *May 2*, 1043.
  - Stock—Information as to Loss of £102,000, *Apr. 29*, 544.

Moore, Mr. W. [Armagh, N.]
- Agriculture Department Vice-President, Qualifications required of, *May 2*, 1081.
- Ballintubber — Hostile Demonstrations against Mr. Payne, *May 1*, 875.
- Bann River Drainage Scheme, Date of proceeding with, *May 2*, 1120–1122.
- Brosna—Cause for Outrage at Forde's House, *May 2*, 1076.
- Central London Railway Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1436–1438.
- Labourers Acts
  - Administration of, Delay in erecting Cottages, Reason for Increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2*, 1154.
  - Allotments under, Granting Powers to District Councils proposed, *May 2*, 1154, 1155.
- National School Teachers—Personal Details inserted in Daily Report Book, *Apr. 26*, 385.
- Questions containing Imputations, Permissibility of, *May 1*, 881.
- Works Board
  - Loans, Facilities for granting smaller Loans, proposed, *May 2*, 1120.
  - Statement made by Employees to Members or to the Press, Penalties for, *May 2*, 1119.

Moray Firth
- Trawling in
  - British Subjects in Subordinate Positions on Foreign Vessels, Reason for prosecuting.
    - *Q.* Sir G. Doughty; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 30*, 681, 682.
  - Foreign Trawlers observed and examined.
    - *Q.* Mr. A. S. Wilson; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 30*, 708.

Morgan, Mr. J. L. [Carmarthen, W.]
- Jurors [Expenses] Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1199, 1200.
- Railway Passengers' Luggage—Amount paid in Insurance and Number of Claims during last five years, *Apr. 25*, 244.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary of State for India* [Montrose Burghs]
- Arbuthnot & Co., Insolvency of—Investigation proposed, *Apr. 25*, 259.
- Army—Pensions of Officers' Widows—Amount paid on Residence in India or England, *Apr. 24*, 29.
  - Strength and Expenditure in 1900, 1901, 1902 and 1906–7, *Apr. 30*, 672.
- Bengal Education Staff, Information as to, *Apr. 25*, 259.

Morley, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
  Bombay
    Aundh, Chief of—Procedure in Trial, *May 6*, 1320.
    Council—Qualifications of Sind Member, *May 1*, 860.
  Calcutta
    Improvement Scheme, Position of, *Apr. 25*, 260.
    Memorial to Queen Victoria, Date of completing, *Apr. 29*, 500.
  Gold Standard Reserve, Position and Extent of, etc., *Apr. 25*, 233.
  Lahore Disturbances—University repressive measures, Government support to, *May 6*, 1311.
  Legislative Councils—Opportunity for discussing Proposals, *Apr. 25*, 258.
  Madras High Court Puisne Judgeship, Claims of Indian Lawyers to, *Apr. 24*, 17.
  Madras Estates Land Bill, Provisions of, *May 6*, 1305, 1321.
  Opium, Benares and Behar Agents' Reports on—placing Copies in the Library, proposed, *May 1*, 860.
  Plague Reports of College of Physicians, Action taken on, *Apr. 29*, 499.
  Railways
    Inquiry—Constitution of Committee, *Apr. 25*, 260.
    Rolling Stock, Increase of, *Apr. 29*, 509.
  Rawalpindi Disturbances, Information as to, *May 6*, 1331, 1332.

Mortgage of Premises Bill
  c. 1R.* *Apr. 24*, 72.

Morton, Mr. A. C. [Sutherland]
  Beer, Ingredients used in, *May 2*, 1068.
  Central London Railway Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1433, 1434, 1437, 1438.
  Education, Committee of Privy Council on—Publication of Names and of Date of Meetings proposed, *Apr. 25*, 290.
  Great Northern and City Railway Bill, *Con.*, *May 6*, 1424–1426, 1430, 1432.
  Political Pensions Bill, Facilities for Passage of, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 287.
  Post Office—Rule as to Addresses in Welsh Language, *May 2*, 1066.
  Rosyth, Price paid for and Date of Commencement of Definite Proposals for utilising as Naval Base, *May 2*, 1053.
  Sutherland—Danger arising from Dog-Poisoning in Neighbourhood of Badininish, *Apr. 25*, 282; *May 6*, 1353.

Motherwell
  Cross Keys Public House, Holder of Certificate for.
    Q. Mr. Findlay; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *May 2*, 1047.

Motors
  Legislative Proposals for dealing with.
    Q. Mr. Walrond; *A.* Dr. Macnamara, *May 6*, 1308, 1309.
  Omnibuses—Complaints as to Refusals to Stop for Intending Passengers.
    Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 2*, 1039.
  Royal Commission Recommendations, Action proposed to be taken on.
    Q. Col. Warde; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 29*, 497, 498.
  Taxation, Increased, on, proposed.
    Os. Mr. H. Beach, *Apr. 24*, 76; Mr. V. Cavendish, 92; Mr. Hunt, 130.

Muckross
  Barytes Mines, Report on.
    Q. Mr. E. Barry; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6*, 1312, 1313.

Mullaghavourneen
  Receivable Order of P. Carey, Reason for Detention of.
    Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6*, 1313, 1314.

Mullaghmore
  Fish-curing Station, Decision as to Establishing.
    Q. Mr. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 511, 512.

Mullingar, Kells and Drogheda Railway Bill
  c. 2R.* *Apr. 29*, 488.
    *Rep.** *May 6*, 1299.

Municipal Elections Bill
  c. 1R.* *Apr. 25*, 294.

Municipal Employees
  Return for Week ended November 3, 1906—Presented *May 1*, 843.

Municipal Representation Bill
  l. 2R., *Apr. 30*, 631.

Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]
  Agriculture Department Vice-President
    Office to be Ministerial and Parliamentary one, and to be vacated on a Change of Government, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 136.
    Plunkett, Sir H., Reasons for Retention in Office—Local Opinion in Ireland, etc., *Apr. 24*, 136–140.

[*cont.*

Murphy, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Education Inspectors
    Appeals Against and Applications for Re-inspection, *May 6*, 1322.
    Transfer, Regulations for and Allegations as to Unfavourable First Reports made, *Apr. 24*, 8.
  Kenmare Estate—Reinstatement Claim of D. O'Shea, *May 6*, 1322.

Murray, Mr. J. [Aberdeenshire, E.]
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 577–582.

Muskerry, Lord
  Colonial Shipping Conference—Reason for Non-Representation of Merchant Service Guild, *Apr. 30*, 657–659.

Myer, Mr. H. [Lambeth, N.]
  Exports and Imports—Classification of Raw Materials and Manufactured Articles in Returns, System of, *Apr. 24*, 35.
  Local Authorities, Legislative Proposals for enabling Women to serve on, *May 2*, 1079.
  Parliamentary Session, Alteration in Period for, proposed, *May 2*, 1084.

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]
  Dublin Metropolitan Police
    Criminal Charges manufactured by, *May 2*, 1095.
    Rates Levied for Upkeep of, Exorbitant Nature of, *May 2*, 1095–1098.
  Dublin Parks, Rate of Wages paid to Men employed in, *May 2*, 1138.

Nantwich
  Post Office—Employment of Relation of Postmaster.
    Q. Mr. D. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 2*, 1046.

Natal
  British Indian Traders, Inquiry into Refusal of Licences to, proposed.
    Q. Sir C. Schwann; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 30*, 693.
  Dinizulu, Libel Action by—Information as to Alleged Interference by Government.
    Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 6*, 1334.

National Debt
  Amendment of Law Relating to Resolution, Reported, *May 1*, 904.
  New Sinking Fund, Addition to, out of Surplus Revenue.
    Os. Mr. McCrae, *Apr. 24*, 97; Mr. Bowles, 108, 109.

National Debt—*cont.*
  Permanent Annual Charge—Resolution Reported, *May 1*, 904.
    Os. Sir F. Banbury, *May 1*, 949; Capt. Craig. 950, 951; Mr. Asquith, 951, 952.
  Reduction of, Provision for.
    Os. Mr. Bowles, *Apr. 24*, 108, 109; Mr. C. Money, 113, 114.
  Return as to, Presented, *May 6*, 1301.
  Unfunded Debt, Information as to.
    Q. Mr. Ashton; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 6*, 1319.

National Physical Laboratory
  Fees received for Work previously done at Kew.
    Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 29*, 537.
  Inquiry, Scope of, and Evidence to be taken by.
    Qs. Mr. Nield; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 24*, 40; *Apr. 25*, 279, 280.

Naturalisation
  See under Aliens.

Naval Lands (Volunteers) Bill
  c. 1R.* *Apr. 25*, 294.

Navy
  First Lord—Rt. Hon. Lord Tweedmouth.
  Financial Secretary—Rt. Hon. E. Robertson.
  Admiral Superintendents at Ports, Policy as to Allowances to for Purposes of Works.
    Os. Mr. A. Lee, Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 345.
  "Antrim," Erosion of Bottom-plates of—Result of Investigation.
    Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 29*, 498.
    Qs. Mr. Joyce, Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 1*, 862.
  Atlantic Fleet, Irish Visit of, Arrangements for.
    Qs. Mr. T. L. Corbett; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 24*, 30.
  Australian Squadron, System of Supplying Stores to.
    Q. Mr. W. Redmond; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 6*, 1324.
  Casualties to Vessels—Returns as to.
    Os. Lord Brassey, *May 1*, 828; Lord Tweedmouth, 829.
    Return ordered, *Apr. 29*, 490.
  Chatham Dockyard Extensions, Information as to.
    Os. Mr. Jenkins, *Apr. 25*, 310; Mr. E. H. Lamb, 330, 331.
  Coaling Facilities, Organisation of Collier Service, proposed.
    Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Apr. 25*, 318.

Navy—*cont.*

Docking Accommodation for Large Vessels.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 296, 297; Mr. Jenkins, 309, 310, 338; Capt. Hervey, 314, 315; Mr. Bellairs, 338; Earl Cawdor, *May 1*, 826–828; Lord Tweedmouth, 834–836; Lord Ellenborough, 838.

"Defiance," Smallpox Case in—Date of Vaccination of Patient.
Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 30*, 676.

Dockyards (*see also sub-headings, names of Dockyards*).

Lead-poisoning Cases during 1906.
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 25*, 231,

Policy with regard to, Criticism of.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Apr. 25*, 319–322; Sir C. Dilke, 323, 324; Sir F. Banbury, 343.

Staff employed in—Comparison with 1905.
Q. Capt. Faber; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 1*, 863.

Subsidising Private Dockyards proposed.
Os. Mr. Bellairs, *Apr. 25*, 320, 321.

Works Department, Rate of Wages paid by.
Q. Sir J. Benn; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 2*, 1036, 1037.

"Duke of Edinburgh," Circumstances of Grounding of.
Os. Mr. Ashley, *Apr. 25*, 316; Mr. Bellairs, 320; Mr. Lambert, 337.

Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Malta, *see those titles.*

Haulbowline Dock, proposed Extension of.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 299, 300.

Home Fleet

Ammunition to be Issued to, Information as to,
Os. Earl Cawdor, *May 1*, 824, 833; Lord Tweedmouth, 834.

Base for, Information as to.
Os. Mr. A. Lee, *Apr. 25*, 306.

Commander-in-Chief of Channel Fleet, Control over.
Os. Earl Cawdor, *May 1*, 823, 833; Lord Tweedmouth, 834.

Constitution of, Manning and Efficiency of Squadrons at the Nore, etc.
Os. Earl Cawdor, *May 1*, 822–824; Lord Tweedmouth, 831–833.

Destroyers, Bases for.
Os. Lord Tweedmouth, *May 1*, 831, 836, 837; Earl Cawdor, 836, 837.

Navy—*cont.*

Home Fleet—*cont.*

Gunnery Instruction in Portsmouth and Devonport Divisions, proposals for.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 24*, 30, 31.

Hydrographer's Report Presented, *Apr. 30*, 663; *May 1*, 821.

Keyham Dockyard Extension, Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 296.

Loan Expenditure, Reduction in.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 295.

Marines, Royal, *see that title.*

Mediterranean Fleet—Rank of Commander-in-Chief and Second-in-Command.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 25*, 257.

Nucleus Crews, Working of System.
Os. Earl Cawdor, *May 1*, 826; Earl of Hardwicke, 838; Lord Tweedmouth, 839; Lord Leith of Fyvie, 839.

Obsolete Vessels in Holy Loch and Kyles of Bute, Sale of.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 2*, 1051.

Osborne College, *see that title.*

Pensions

Mullen, J., Case of.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 1*, 858, 859.

Symes, D., Claim of.
Q. Mr. Rendall; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 24*, 24.

Pilotage and Navigation, Extension of Courses for Junior Officers, proposed.
Os. Lord Brassey, *May 1*, 828; Lord Tweedmouth, 829, 830.

Policy as to Increase of Power.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 25*, 289.

Portsmouth Dockyards.

Lock, New, Proposals as to Construction of.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 298, 336, 337; Mr. A. Lee, 306–308, 312; Sir F. Banbury, 311; Mr. Mond, 312; Mr. Ashley, 316, 317; Mr. Bellairs, 318; Sir G. Parker, 329, 330; Mr. W. Rutherford, 332, 333, 334; Sir F. Banbury, 342.

Rate of Pay at, Payment of Trade Union Rates, proposed.
Os. Mr. J. Ward, *Apr. 25*, 334, 335, 336; Mr. Lambert, 336.
Q. Mr. Bramsdon; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 2*, 1036.

[*cont.*

Navy—*cont.*
Repairs—State of the Ships of the Fleet in January 1905 and 1907, Statement as to, proposed.
Os. Earl Cawdor, *May 1*, 822, 824–826; Lord Leith of Fyvie, 839.
Rosyth Base
Policy as to.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 298, 299; *Mr. A. Lee*, 303–305, 317, 338; Mr. C. E. Price, 315; Mr. Ashley, 316; Mr. Bellairs, 317, 322; Sir C. Dilke, 323, 324; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 326, 327; Mr. E. Robertson, 328; Mr. Arnold-Forster, 328, 329; Mr. E. H. Lamb, 330, 331; Major Anstruther-Gray, 331, 332; Mr. W. Rutherford, 333, 334; Mr. J. Ward, 335; Mr. Younger, 335; Earl Cawdor, *May 1*, 827; Lord Tweedmouth, 835; Lord Ellenborough, 837, 838; Lord Leith of Fyvie, 840.
Price Paid for, and Date of Commencement of Definite Proposals for Utilising as Naval Base.
Qs. Mr. C. E. Price, Mr. Watt, Sir G. Parker, Mr. Bellairs, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. Morton, Mr. A. Cross; *As.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 2*, 1052–1054.
Staff Employed at.
Q. Mr. A. Lee; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 24*, 31.
Shipbuilding
Bottom-plates, Place of Manufacture of.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *May 1*, 861.
Foreign Material, Facilities for Buying under Present Conditions.
Qs. Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. Deputy-Speaker, *May 1*, 861, 862.
German Programme, Information as to Increase in.
Q. Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 25*, 256, 257.
Stokers, Proposals for Increasing Supply of.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 24*, 24.
Submarine Mines, Abolition of Proposals as to Sale of Plant, etc.
Os. Sir C. Dilke, *Apr. 25*, 341.
"Swiftsure" and "Triumph," Reserve of Guns for.
Q. Mr. Nield; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 24*, 30.
Turbine Machinery, Facilities for Repair of, at Foreign Naval Stations.
Os. Mr. Ashley, *Apr. 25*, 341.
Works, Granite used in, Source of Origin of.
Os. Mr. Hunt, *Apr. 25*, 332.

Navy Estimates
Civil Pensions and Gratuities—£370,000, *Com.* Apr. 25*, 345; *Rep.* May 2*, 1164.
Half Pay, Reserved and Retired Pay—£837,900, *Com.* Apr. 25*, 345; *Rep.* May 2*, 1164.
Pensions, Gratuities and Compassionate Allowances — £1,302,000, *Com.* Apr. 25*, 345.
Vote 8, Date of Taking.
Qs. Mr. M. Macdonald, Mr. Bellairs; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 2*, 1078.
Works, Buildings and Repairs —£2,758,400, *Com., Apr. 25*, 294; *Rep.* May 2*, 1164.
Transfer of Liabilities from Works Loans to the Vote, Policy of.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 294, 295, 300; Mr. A. Lee, 300–303, 317; Mr. Mond, 313; Mr. Bellairs, 317.

Neath, Pontardawe and Brynaman Railway Bill
l. 1R.* *Apr. 24*, 1.

New Hebrides
Anglo-French Committee, Date of Meeting.
Q. Mr. Walrond; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 6*, 1307.
Arms and Spirits, Regulation of Traffic in, proposed.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 24*, 32, 33.

New Junction Canal
Tolls and Charges — Report Presented, *Apr. 29*, 489; *Apr. 30*, 631.

Newark
Poor Law Guardians, Wages paid by, to Persons Seeking Employment.
Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 2*, 1048.

Newfoundland
Fisheries — Date of Tabling Papers.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 1*, 866.

Newton, Lord
House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1203–1216.
Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 475.

Newtownards
Woman Charged with Larceny, Cause for Supply of Whisky to.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 26, 27.

Nicaragua
Salado—Circumstances of Cutting down of British Flag.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 2*, 1059.

Nicholls, Mr. G. [Northants, N.]
  Transvaal Chinese Labour—Circumstances of Admitting Unlicensed Coolies, *May 6*, 1337.

Nield, Mr. H. [Middlesex, Ealing]
  National Physical Laboratory
    Fees received for Work previously done at Kew, *Apr. 29*, 537.
    Inquiry, Scope of, and Evidence to be taken by, *Apr. 24*, 40; *Apr. 25*, 279.
  Navy
    Home Fleet—Proposals for Gunnery Instruction in Portsmouth and Devonport Divisions, *Apr. 24*, 30.
    Stokers, Proposals for Increasing Supply of, *Apr. 24*, 24.
  "Swiftsure" and "Triumph," Reserve of Guns for, *Apr. 24*, 30.
  Worthing Gas Bill, *Con., Apr. 29*, 612.

North East London Railway Bill
  c. Con. Apr. 24*, 3.
    3R.* *Apr. 29*, 487.
  l. 1R.* *Apr. 30*, 630.

Northumberland, Duke of
  House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1237–1243, 1276, 1277, 1279.

Nugent, Sir W. [Westmeath, S.]
  Westmeath—Death Duty Grant, Amount Deducted from, *Apr. 24*, 68.

O'Brien, Mr. K. E. [Tipperary, Mid.]
  Education (Ireland) Act, 1892, Disposal of Fines under, *May 6*, 1321.
  Lamphiere Estate—Reinstatement Claims of P. Cormack, and J. Feehan, *Apr. 26*, 383.
  Longford Pass—Reinstatement Claims of Mr. Morris and E. Kealy, *May 6*, 1305.

O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
  Dublin Metropolitan Police—Conduct of Sergeant Cox, in Licensing Prosecution, *Apr. 24*, 22.

Ocean Accident and Guarantee Coporation Bill
  l. Rep. May 2*, 994.

O'Connor, Mr. Jas. [Wicklow, W.]
  Boyle Postman, Allowance to, for Use of Pony, *May 6*, 1304.
  Brora—Reason for Delay in Replying to Applications of Mr. D. Mackay, *May 6*, 1302.
  Plymouth Post Office Revision, Date of Carrying-out, *May 6*, 1303.

O'Connor, Mr. John [Kildare, N.]
  Arterial Drainage, Failure of Board of Works to deal with, *May 2*, 1134–1136.
  Bann River Drainage Scheme, Date of Proceeding with, *May 2*, 1133, 1135.

O'Connor, Mr. John—*cont.*
  Land Purchase Stock Issued to 31st March, *May 2*, 1043.
  Robertstown Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *May 2*, 1046.
  Works Board, Administration by, Alleged Failure of, *May 2*, 1133, 1134.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]
  Blennerhasset Estate, Sale Proposals for, and Rent Decrees issued, *May 1*, 878.
  Irish Language, Proposals for Teaching in Schools, *May 1*, 885.
  Kerry
    Poor Law Unions—Salaries paid to Medical Officers, *May 1*, 853.
    Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, Progress made with, *Apr. 24*, 46.
  Murphy, D., and M. O'Sullivan, Inquiry into Cases of, *Apr. 24*, 46.
  Poor Law Dispensary Doctors, Salaries of and Source of Contributions towards, *Apr. 24*, 20.

O'Donovan Estate
  Purchase Proposals for.
    Q. Mr. Gilhooly; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 286.

O'Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, S.]
  Arterial Drainage, Failure of Board of Works to deal with, *May 2*, 1123.
  Geevagh Band—Circumstances of Firing Gun by Conlon, *Apr. 25*, 253.
  Keogh Estate, Purchase of, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 284.
  Phibbs Estate, Purchase and Disposal of, *Apr. 25*, 231.
  Poor Law—Irish Reform Proposals, *May 6*, 1314.
  Works Board, Administration by, Alleged Failure of, *May 2*, 1122, 1123.

O'Grady, Mr. J. [Leeds, E.]
  Beith Academy, *Status* of, *Apr. 24*, 42.
  Bristol Postal Mail Van Drivers, Hours of Duty and Wages of, *Apr. 25*, 276.
  India—Bhagalpur District Magistrate—Alleged Improper use of Influence with Indian Gentlemen, *Apr. 30*, 686.
  Leeds Elementary Schools, Teaching of Music in, *May 2*, 1068.

O'Kelly, Mr. J. [Roscommon, N.]
  Carrick-on-Shannon—Circumstance of Striking of Mr. Cooney by Constable, *May 1*, 887.
  King-Harman Estate—Holdings purchased by Mr. Drury, *May 1*, 888.

Old-age Pensions
- Calculations as to Number of Persons benefiting under Scheme starting on £2,250,000.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 25,* 269.
- Government Proposals.
  - *Os.* Mr. Snowden, *Apr. 24,* 79, 81; Mr. S. T. Evans, 84, 89; Mr. McCrae, 101; Mr. J. F. Mason, 103; Mr. C. Money, 118, 119; Mr. T. Taylor, 132.
- Intoxicants, Supplying to Pensioners—Proposals as to Penalty.
  - *Qs.* Mr. H. Cox, Mr. L. Jones; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 25,* 269.
- Poor Relief and Friendly Societies, effect on, in Colonies and Germany.
  - *Qs.* Mr. H. Cox, Mr. R. Duncan; *As.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 25,* 269, 270.

O'Malley, Mr. W. [Galway, Connemara]
- Clifden Pier Works, Cause of Delay in commencing, *May 2,* 1074.
- Lettermore Distress Committee, Constitution of, *May 2,* 1074.

O'Mara, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, S.]
- Land Purchase Stock, Sinking Fund applicable to Redemption of, *May 1,* 847.

Onslow, Earl of
- Small Holdings
  - Crown Lands, Experiments made with, *Apr. 25,* 203.
  - Report and Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry, *Apr. 25,* 205.

Opium
- Indian—Placing Copies of Reports of Benares and Behar Opium Agents in Library, proposed.
  - *Q.* Sir H. Cotton; *A.* Mr. Morley, *May, 1,* 860.

Orange River Colony
- British Settlers, Position of.
  - *Qs.* Mr. Lonsdale, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 6,* 1344.

Oranmore
- Disturbance at House of P. Burke, Cause for—Arrests made by Police, etc.
  - *Qs.* Mr. C. Craig; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *May 2,* 1075.

Ordnance Maps
- Irish—Designation of Catholic Places of Worship.
  - *Q.* Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Sir E. Strachey, *Apr. 30,* 675.

O'Rourke Estate
- Purchase Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Hazleton; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29,* 512.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]
- Butter and Margarine Bill—Effect on Salt Firkin Butter, *May 2,* 1077.
- Delmage Estate Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 29,* 514; *May 6,* 1302.
- Labourers Acts, Administration of, Delay in erecting Cottages, Reason for Increase in Estimate, etc., *May 2,* 1163.

Osborne College
- Epidemics at, Causes of—Sanitary Condition of the College, etc.
  - *Os.* Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25,* 297.
- Hospital, proposed Erection of.
  - *Os.* Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25,* 297; Mr. Bellairs, 319.

Pacific Islanders Act
- Amendment, Proposals for.
  - *Q.* Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6,* 1362.

Paddington Borough Council
- Home-Workers employed by—Reason for Refusal to supply Addresses.
  - *Q.* Mr. C. Money; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 2,* 1063, 1064.
- Refusal to take Proceedings against certain Local Traders, Reason for, etc.
  - *Q.* Dr. Cooper; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 24,* 33.

Paisley
- Licensed Premises, Alterations to—Identity of Workmen employed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lea; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 29,* 539, 540.

Palestine
- Trade Report, Presented, *May 2,* 995.

Parker, Sir G. [Gravesend]
- Africa, Central—Embargo on Native Labour Recruitment, *May 1,* 865.
- Colonial Conference, 1907—Proceedings, Arrangements for Publishing, *Apr. 25,* 262.
- Edalji Case Inquiry—Date of Presenting Report, *Apr. 25,* 274.
- Egypt, Destitution in, *May 2,* 1061.
- Jamaica—Publication of Correspondence as to Resignation of Sir A. Swettenham, *Apr. 30,* 689–691.
- Navy
  - Portsmouth Dockyards Lock, New, Proposals as to Construction of, *Apr. 25,* 329, 330.
  - Rosyth, Price paid for and Date of Commencement of definite Proposals for utilising as Naval Base, *May 2,* 1053.

[*cont.*

Parker, Sir G.—*cont.*
  Orange River Colony—Position of British Settlers, *May 6*, 1344.
  St. Lucia Riots, Information as to and Measures taken to restore Order, *May 2*, 1056.
  Tea Duty, Reduction of, to Fourpence per Pound, proposed, *May 1*, 921–923.
  Transvaal Chinese Labour, Repatriations effected, Cost of, *May 6*, 1334.

Parliament
  House of Commons
    Committees, *see that title.*
    Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms—Report Presented, *May 1*, 900.
  House of Lords
    Appeals to from Court of Session—Reduction of Time, proposed.
      Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. T. Shaw, *Apr. 24*, 42, 43.
    Fee Fund—Annual Account Presented, *Apr. 29*, 463.
    New Peer introduced—Baron Allendale, *Apr. 25*, 177.
    Procedure in Debate—Appointment of
      Select Committee of Inquiry into Standing Orders relating to—*Motion* [Earl Beauchamp], *May 1*, 840.

Parliament Street
  Post Office—Sentence on J. Baines for Theft of Ink-pot from.
    Q. Mr. Lehmann; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 29*, 506.

Parliamentary Elections
  New Writ issued for Surrey (Wimbledon), *Apr. 29*, 487.

Parliamentary Procedure
  Bills, Referring to Standing Committees, *see under* Bills.
  Blocking Bills and Motions, Decision as to dealing with.
    Q. Lord R. Cecil; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 24*, 69.
    Qs. Mr. Bowles, Lord R. Cecil; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1362, 1363.
  Business Committee, Establishment of, proposed.
    Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1369; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1376, 1409; Mr. Soares, 1404; Mr. S. T. Evans, 1412; Mr. Courthope, 1414.
  Curtailment of Debate and Interference with Liberties of the House, Objections to.
    Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 6*, 1374–1376; Lord R. Cecil, 1397, 1398; Mr. Bowles, 1405.

Parliamentary Procedure—*cont.*
  Session, Alteration in Period for, proposed.
    Qs. Mr. S. T. Evans, Mr. W. Redmond, Mr. R. Duncan, Mr. Myer; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 2*, 1083, 1084.
  Standing Orders, *see that title.*

Pasley Children Legitimisation Bill
  l. 1R.* *May 1*, 993.

Pearce, Mr. W. [Tower Hamlets, Limehouse]
  Lunacy Grant under Local Government Act—Extention to Workhouse Patients proposed, *May 2*, 1049.

Pease, Mr. H. P. [Darlington]
  Army
    Artillery, Garrison, Strength of—Effect of check on Recruiting, *Apr. 29*, 517.
    Strength in 1905 and Present Time, *Apr. 29*, 517.
  Canada
    Iron and Steel Manufactures, Import of—Effect on British Goods of New Tariff, *Apr. 29*, 492.
    Negotiations with Foreign Powers, Proper Channels for, *Apr. 25*, 264.
    Tariff
      Arrangements with Foreign Powers—Effect on British Preferential Rates, *Apr. 25*, 264.
      Rate on British Goods, *Apr. 25*, 277.
  Colonial Conference, 1907
    Preference Resolutions—Publication of Speech of Chancellor of the Exchequer, *May 6*, 1359.
    Proceedings, Arrangements for Publishing, *Apr. 25*, 261.
  Exports and Imports—Relative Average Prices in 1900 and 1906, *Apr. 25*, 245.
    Return based on—Reason for Choice of Year, *Apr. 25*, 244.
  Income Tax, Compulsory Returns, Estimated Effect of, on Receipts, *Apr. 25*, 232.
  Jamaica—Opportunity given for withdrawal of Sir A. Swettenham's Resignation, *Apr. 30*, 692.
  "Mikado," Withdrawal of Licence from, *May 6*, 1347.
  Spirits, Plain, imported during last Twenty Years—Duty paid, *Apr. 25*, 249.
  Transvaal Chinese Labour—Statistics as to Number employed and Importations in 1907, *Apr. 30*, 692.
  Vagrancy, Proposals for dealing with, *May 6*, 1357.

Pease, Mr. H. P.—*cont.*
Woolwich Arsenal Discharges—Number projected and Proposals for working Short Time, *Apr. 29*, 525.
Zanzibar, Slavery in Coast Strip, Abolition of—Contents of Despatch of January, *Apr. 24*, 31.

Penal Servitude Acts
Conditional Licence granted, *Apr. 30*, 662; *May 1*, 822.

Perks, Mr. R. W. [Lincolnshire, Louth]
Channel Tunnel Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 347.

Persia
British and Russian Sphere of Influence, Progress of Negotiations as to.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 268.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 1*, 867.
National Bank, German Assistance in Establishment of.
Q. Mr. Bowles; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 266.

Phibb's Estate
Purchase and Disposal of.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 25*, 231.

Phosphorus Poisoning
Moreland & Co., Messrs., Fatal Case at Factory of.
Os. Earl of Lytton, *Apr. 25*, 179; Earl Beauchamp, 185.
Prohibition of use of White and Yellow Phosphorus in March Industry—Reconsideration of Attitude towards Convention of Berne, proposed.
Os. Earl of Lytton, *Apr. 25*, 179–184; Earl Beauchamp, 184, 185.

Piers and Harbours, Ireland
Development of, Failure of Board of Works to deal with.
Os. Mr. Delany, *May 2*, 1114, 1115; Sir T. Esmonde, 1125, 1126.
Dredgers, Regulations as to Provision of.
Os. Mr. H. Law, *May 2*, 1123, 1127; Mr. Runciman, 1127.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill
l. 1R.* *Apr. 29*, 462.

Plunkett, Sir H.
Agriculture Department Vice-presidency, Resignation of—*see under* Agriculture and Technical Department.
Scottish Agricultural Commissioner, Offer of Position of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Lamont; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *Apr. 29*, 540, 541.

Plymouth
Post Office Revision, Date of carrying out.
Q. Mr. James O'Connor; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 6*, 1303.

Police
Accounts Presented, *Apr. 30*, 631.
Reports of Inspectors Presented, *Apr. 25*, 179, 489.

Political Pensions
Declaration required of Applicants for—Effect on Eligibility as Parliamentary Candidate.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1362.

Political Pensions Bill
Facilities for Passage of, proposed.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 25*, 287.

Poor Law
Children
Boarding-out System, Extension of in Ireland, proposed.
Os. Mr. Power, *May 2*, 1142; Mr. Boland, 1143; Mr. Birrell, 1148.
Number Dependent on Poor Relief.
Q. Mr. L. Haslam; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 24*, 25.
Workhouses and Infirmaries, Number in.
Q. Mr. W. Priestley; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr 25*, 250
Commission, Scope of and Returns called for by.
Qs Mr. V. Kennedy; *As.* Mr. Burns, *May 2*, 1066.
Ireland
Dispensary Doctors, Salaries of and Source of Contributions towards.
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 20.
Reform, Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30*, 712.
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6*, 1314, 1315.
Returns as to Pauperism, Necessity for and Work involved in preparing.
Q. Dr. Ambrose; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 514, 515.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. J. Burns, *Apr. 30*, 700.
Married Applicants for Relief, production of Marriage Certificate by—Practice in Kensington and Bethnal Green.
Q. Mr. Alden; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 24*, 26.

Port Talbot Railway and Docks Bill
c. Con. Apr. 25*, 228.
3R.* *Apr. 29*, 487.
l. 1R.* *Apr. 30*, 630.

Portland
Firing Practice between Weymouth and St. Albans Head, Damage done to Lobster Fishery by.
Q. Mr. Scarisbrick; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 25*, 245, 246.
Naval Works and Buildings, Expenditure on.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 296.

Portobello and Musselburgh Tramways (Port Seton Deviation) Order Confirmation Bill
l. Royal Assent, *Apr. 29*, 461.

Portsmouth
Dockyard, *see under* Navy.
Factory at, Explanation of Vote for.
Os. Sir F. Banbury, *Apr. 25*, 335, 342; Mr. Lambert, 336.
Harbour Entrance, Proposals for Widening.
Os. Mr. Lea, *Apr. 25*, 335.

Portsmouth, Earl of—*Under-Secretary of State for War.*
Tenant, Allegations as to Harsh Treatment of.
Qs. Mr. Lea, Mr. J. Ward, Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Sir E. Strachey, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *Apr. 29*, 538, 539.
Qs. Mr. Lea, Mr. Rees, Lord R. Cecil, Mr. Long, Captain Faber, Mr. Flavin; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, *May 1*, 892–895.
Parliamentary Discussion, Opportunity for, etc.
Qs. Lord R. Cecil, Captain Faber, Mr. Lea; *As.* H. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Speaker, *May 6*, 1360, 1361.
Territorial Force
Age for Recruitment, etc., *Apr. 29*, 483.
Continental Troops, Possibility of Meeting, Amount of Drill required, etc., *Apr. 29*, 483.
Drill, Minimum Annual Requirements, *Apr. 29*, 483, 486.
Mobilisation, Provisions for, *Apr. 29*, 484.

Post Office
Postmaster-General—Rt. Hon. S. Buxton.
[*See also* names of places.]
Chief Medical Officer, Salary of.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 1*, 845.
Christmas Supplements, Facilities for Transmission of.
Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 6*, 1303.

Post Office—*cont.*
Eastern District Office, Full-time Casual Sorters employed in.
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 25*, 243.
Ireland, Stores in—Position of Staff under New Arrangements.
Q. Mr. Field; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 6*, 1316.
Mail Service—Australian Contracts, Arrangements for.
Qs. Mr. W. Redmond; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *May 2*, 1067, 1068.
Overseers in London Service, Qualifications required of.
Q. Mr. A. Allen; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 6*, 1350.
Parcels Post
Registered Packets, Rule as to sealing of.
Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 1*, 869.
Spain and Balearic Islands—Warrant Presented, *Apr. 29*, 463, 489.
Sick Leave—Regulations as to Sick Pay.
Q. Mr. G. Clarke, Major Anstruther-Gray; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *May 2*, 1067.
Sorters—Proposals for abolishing Open Competition.
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 26*, 376.
Welsh Language, Rule as to Addresses in.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 2*, 1066.

Post Office Savings Bank
Annuities, Provisions as to Compounding for.
Q. Mr. Ashley; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 2*, 1037.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]
Labourers Acts, Allotments under, granting Powers to District Councils, proposed, *May 2*, 1142, 1143.
Poor Law Children—Boarding-out System, Extension of in Ireland, proposed, *May 2*, 1142.

President of the Board of Agriculture
Rt. Hon. Earl Carrington.

President of the Board of Education
Rt. Hon. R. McKenna.

President of the Board of Trade
Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.

President of the Local Government Board
Rt. Hon. J. Burns.

Press
Dissemination of News by, in Time of War, Government Control over, etc.
Os. Lord Ellenborough, *Apr. 29*, 479; Lord Tweedmouth, 480–482; Earl Cawdor, 482.

Price, Mr. C. E. [Edinburgh, Central]
  Bankruptcy Laws Inquiry—Date of Presenting Report, etc., *May 6*, 1308.
  India
    Calcutta Improvement Scheme, Position of, *Apr. 25*, 260.
    Railways Inquiry—Constitution of Committee, *Apr. 25*, 260.
  Land Valuation (Scotland) Bill, Date of Introducing, *May 6*, 1360.
  Navy—Rosyth, Policy as to, *Apr. 25*, 315 ; *May 2*, 1052, 1053.
  Railways—Intoxicants given by the Public to Employees, Rule prohibiting, *Apr. 25*, 278.
  Taxation, Surveyors' Clerks, *Status* of—Inquiry proposed, *May 2*, 1070.
  Tea Duty, Reduction of, to 4d. per Pound, proposed, *May 1*, 924.

Priestley, Mr. W. E. B. [Bradford, E.]
  Poor Law Children—Number in Workhouses and Infirmaries, *Apr. 25*, 250.

Prisons
  See also Names of Places.
  Scotland—Annual Report Presented, *Apr. 24*, 2, 6.

Prohibition of Medical Practice by Companies Bill
  l. 2R., *Apr. 29*, 464.

Public Accounts Committee
  Report of, Allowing Opportunity for Discussion of.
    Os. Mr. V. Cavendish, *Apr. 24*, 95 ; Mr. Asquith, 96.

Public Petitions Committee
  Report brought up and Read, *May 2*, 1086.

Public Trustee Act
  Extension to Ireland, proposed.
    Q. Sir T. Esmonde ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30*, 680.

Questions
  Hypothetical, out of Order, *Apr. 29*, 539.
  Imputations in, not in Order.
    Qs. Captain Donelan, Mr. T. L. Corbett, Mr. Moore ; *As.* Mr. Deputy-Speaker, *May 1*, 880, 881.
  Irish Matters, asked on—Imputation contained in Speech of Chief Secretary at Halifax.
    Os. Viscount Turnour, Mr. Belloc, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 896–898.
    Qs. Viscount Turnour, Mr. T. L. Corbett ; *As.* Mr. Speaker, Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 544, 545.
  Irrelevant, *May 1*, 874 ; *May 6*, 1359.

Questions—*cont.*
  Matter of Opinion, Question on, not in Order, *May 6*, 1349.
  Notice to be given of, *Apr. 29*, 545 ; *May 1*, 862 ; *May 2*, 1058.
  Out of Order, *Apr. 30*, 703 ; *May 1*, 862, 894, 895 ; *May 2*, 1076, 1077 ; *May 6*, 1361.
  Repetition not in Order, *Apr. 24*, 35.
  Statement may not be made during Time for, *May 2*, 1062.

Railways
  Correspondence between Board of Trade and Companies, Matters included in Arrangements referred to.
    Q. Mr. Hooper ; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *May 2*, 1038.
  Intoxicants given by the Public to Employees, Rule prohibiting.
    Qs. Mr. L. Jones, Mr. C. E. Price ; *As.* Mr. Kearley, *Apr. 25*, 277, 278.
  Lancashire and Yorkshire Company Agreement with London and North Western, Deposit of.
    Q. Mr. M. Macdonald ; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *May 2*, 1064.
  Luggage of Passengers—Amount paid in Insurance and Number of Claims during last five Years.
    Q. Mr. Morgan ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 25*, 244.
  Protection of Passengers from Bad Characters attending Race Meetings, Measures for.
    Q. Mr. Lea ; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 29*, 531.
  Rates on Conveyance of Fruit and Vegetables.
    Q. Mr. Watt ; *A.* Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 30*, 697.
  Subscriptions to Party Organisations, Prohibition of—Legislative Proposals.
    Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 25*, 351, Mr. Trevelyan, 355 ; Mr. Lea, 357 ; H. Cox, 358 ; Mr. Kearley, Mr. 366 ; Mr. Herbert, 367.
    Schedules of Accounts to give Details of, proposed.
      Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, *Apr. 25*, 350, 351 ; Mr. Trevelyan, 355 ; Mr. Kearley, 366.

Ramsgate
  St. George's and Ellington Schools, Rooms in use at—Proposals for New Buildings.
    Q. Mr. Alden ; *A.* Mr. McKenna, *Apr. 25*, 230.

Rates and Rating
  London Rates, Proposals for Equalisation of.
    Q. Dr. Cooper ; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 29*, 533.

[*cont.*

Rates and Rating—*cont.*
- Poor Rate, Number of Persons struck off Voters' List for Non-payment of, in Ireland.
  - *Q.* Mr. J. Redmond; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 500, 501.

Rathkeale
- District Council, Charges of Extravagance against.
  - *Q.* Mr. Arkwright; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6*, 1315.

Rawlinson, Mr. J. F. P [Cambridge University]
- Hire Purchase Agreements, Stamp Duty on, *May 1*, 946.
- War Taxes, Reasons for Continuing as a Permanent Charge, *May 1*, 936.

Rawtenstall Corporation Bill
- *c.* 3R.* *Apr. 25*, 228.
- *l.* 1R.* *Apr. 29*, 461.

Redmond, Mr. J. E. [Waterford]
- Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department—Vice-President.
  - Office to be a Ministerial and Parliamentary one, and to be vacated on a Change of Government, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 159–161.
  - Plunkett, Sir H., Reason for Retention in Office—Local Opinion in Ireland, etc., *Apr. 24*, 159–161.
- Business of the House, Course of, *Apr. 25*, 291.
- Education, Intermediate—Parliamentary Discussion, Facilities for, *May 2*, 1082.
- Land Purchase
  - Financial Working, Inquiry into or Opportunity for Discussion, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 67.
  - Funds, Amount Lying in Banks, without Interest, *Apr. 24*, 66.
  - Stock—Regulations as to Payments of Interest, *Apr. 29*, 542.
- Rates—Number of Persons Struck off Voters' List for Non-payment of Poor Rate, *Apr. 29*, 500.

Redmond, Mr. W. H. K. [Clare, E.]
- Australian Naval Squadron, System of supplying Stores to, *May 6*, 1324.
- Ballaghaline Fishing Pier, Necessity for proceeding with, *Apr. 30*, 710.
- Clare Evicted Tenants—Progress made with Reinstatements, *May 2*, 1072.
- Clooney—United Irish League Meeting, Reason for prohibiting, *May 1*, 853.
- Dublin Metropolitan Police
  - Numerical Strength of in Excess of Requirements, Alleged, *May 2*, 1105.
  - Rates Levied for Upkeep of, Exorbitant Nature of, *May 2*, 1102–1106.

Redmond, W. H. K.—*cont.*
- Parliamentary Session, Alteration in Period for, proposed, *May 2*, 1083.
- Post Office Mail Contracts—Arrangements as to Australia, *May 2*, 1067, 1068.
- Tobacco Growing in Ireland, Government Assistance towards, *May 1*, 941.

Rees, Mr. J. D. [Montgomery Boroughs]
- Africa, Central—Embargo on Native Labour Recruitment, *May 1*, 865.
- British Columbia Immigration Bill, Subject of, *May 1*, 866.
- Coffee—Legalised Vegetable Adulterants introduced in 1906, *Apr. 30*, 674.
- Great Northern and City Railway Bill, *Con.*, *May 6*, 1429–1431.
- Hague Conference, British Delegates, Powers of, as to Question of Limitation of Armaments, *Apr. 24*, 33.
- Housing of the Working Classes—Legislative Proposals as to Transfer of Powers from Rural District Councils, *Apr. 24*, 38, 39.
- India
  - Army, Pensions of Officers' Widows—Amount paid on Residence in India or England, *Apr. 24*, 29.
  - Madras Estates Land Bill, Provisions of, *May 6*, 1305, 1320.
  - Punjaub—Information as to Rawalpindi Disturbance, *May 6*, 1331.
  - Railway Inquiry — Constitution of Committee, *Apr. 25*, 260.
- Portsmouth, Earl of—Allegations as to Harsh Treatment of Tenant, *May 1*, 892.
- Tea Duty, Reduction of, to 4d. per Pound, proposed, *May 1*, 909, 910.
- Turkey Customs Increase—Progress of Negotiations and Proposals for laying Papers, *May 1*, 867.
- United States—New York Peace Congress, Information as to, *Apr. 24*, 69.

Remnant, Mr. J. F. [Finsbury, Holborn]
- Dumbarton Church Property Trust, Disposal of, *May 6*, 1317.
- Jamaica—Publication of Correspondence as to Resignation of Sir A. Swettenham, *Apr. 30*, 690.
- Liquor Traffic—Information as to London County Compensation Fund, *May 6*, 1348, 1349.

Rendall, Mr. A. [Gloucester, Thornbury]
- Navy Pensions—Claim of Daniel Symes, *Apr. 24*, 24.

Revenue and Expenditure
- Contributions by and Expenditure on. England, Scotland, and Ireland (1906 7)—Return Ordered, *May 2*, 1036.

[*cont.*

Revenue and Expenditure—*cont.*
  Surplus of Revenue from 1906–7.
    Os. Mr. Bowles, *Apr. 24*, 106, 107.
  Total Expenditure for 1906–7.
    Os. Mr. Bowles, *Apr. 24*, 107, 108.

Rhodesia
  Chartered Company, Complaints against—Action proposed to be taken.
    Q. Mr. Stanger; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 30*, 687, 688.

Richards, Mr. T. F. [Wolverhampton, W.]
  Army—Adult Employees in Ordnance and Clothing Factories earning less than 30s. per week, *Apr. 30*, 685.
  Bournville Postmen, Sunday Pay of, *Apr. 30*, 701.

Richmond Park
  Road from Richmond Hill Gate to Kingston Gate—Date of completing Repairs.
    Q. Mr. Cave; *A.* Mr. Harcourt, *May 1*, 859.

Richmond [Surrey] Electricity Supply Bill
  l. 2R.* *May 2*, 994.

Ridley, Viscount
  Companies Bill, *Com.*, *May 2*, 996, 997, 998, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004, 1015, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019, 1021, 1022, 1029, 1030.

Ridsdale, M. E. A. [Brighton]
  Worthing Gas Bill, *Con.*, *Apr. 29*, 599–603, 608, 615.

Rifle Clubs
  Rifles, old Lee-Metford, or Lee-Enfield, Issue of, proposed.
    Qs. Mr. Carlilie; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29*, 518.
  Rook-shooting, permitting without taking out of Gun Licence, proposed.
    Qs. Mr. H. Beach; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *May 2*, 1069.

Rights of Way
  Proposals for Preservation of.
    Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 29*, 546, 547.

Ripon, Marquess of—*Lord Privy Seal*
  Municipal Representation Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 654–656.
  Small Holdings
    Act of 1892, Failure of, *Apr. 25*, 207.
    Speech by Prime Minister at Holborn Restaurant, Terms of, *Apr. 25*, 208.

Roberts, Mr. C. H. [Lincoln]
  Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26*, 410–415.

Roberts, Mr. G. H. [Norwich]
  Compulsory Weighing and Measurements Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1171–1176.
  Mining Operations under the Sea, Crown Leases required for, *Apr. 30*, 704.

Roberts, Mr. J. H. [Denbighshire, W.]
  India
    Budget, Date of Discussing, *Apr. 30*, 687.
    Liquors and Drugs Excise and Customs Revenues on (1903–6), *Apr. 30*, 687.
    Opium Shops — Number Licensed (1903–7), *Apr. 30*, 687.
  Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26*, 438–439, 442.

Roberts, Mr. S. [Sheffield, Ecclesall]
  Income Tax, Reduction of 1d. in the Pound, proposed, *May 1*, 959.

Robertson, Lord
  House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1263–1269.

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*Secretary to the Admiralty* [Dundee]
  Admiralty
    Contracts, Conditions of—Specifications as to British Materials, *May 6*, 1325.
    Messengers Appointed in 1906–7, *Apr. 30*, 676.
  "Antrim," Result of Investigation into Erosion of Bottom-plates, *Apr. 29*, 498; *May 1*, 862.
  Atlantic Fleet, Irish Visit of, Arrangements for, *Apr. 24*, 30.
  Australian Squadron, System of Supplying Stores to, *May 6*, 1324.
  Coastguard
    Inquiry
      Action to be taken on Report, *Apr. 30*, 682.
      Information as to, *May 1*, 863.
    Number of Men affected by Closing of Stations, *May 1*, 862, 863.
    Stations closed—Disposal of Men, *Apr. 25*, 256.
  "Defiance," Smallpox Case in—Date of Vaccination of Patient, *Apr. 30*, 676.
  Dockyards
    Lead-poisoning Cases during 1906, *Apr. 25*, 231.
    Staff Employed in—Comparison with 1905, *May 1*, 863.
    Works Department, Rate of Wages paid by *May 2*, 1037.
  Home Fleet—Proposals for Gunnery Instruction in Portsmouth and Devonport Divisions, *Apr. 24*, 31.

[*cont.*

Robertson, Rt. Hon. E.—*cont.*
- Marines, Royal—New Regulations as to Officers, *Apr. 30*, 683 ; *May 2*, 1052.
- Mediterranean Fleet, Rank of Commander-in Chief and Second-in-Command, *Apr. 25*, 257.
- "Mikado"—Prohibition of Performance by Naval and Marine Bands, *May 6*, 1323, 1324.
- Obsolete Vessels in Holy Loch and Kyles of Bute, Sale of, *Mar. 2*, 1051.
- Pensions
  - Mullen, J., Case of, *May 1*, 859.
  - Symes, D., Claim of, *Apr. 24*, 24.
- Portland Firing Practice, Damage done to Lobster Fishery by, *Apr. 25*, 246.
- Portsmouth Dockyard—Rate of Wages paid to Labourers by Contractor, *May 2*, 1036.
- Rosyth
  - Policy as to, *Apr. 25*, 328 ; *May 2*, 1052, 1054.
  - Staff Employed at, *Apr. 24*, 31.
- St. Lucia Riots—Warships within Two Days Steam of the Island, *Apr. 29*, 498.
- Shipbuilding
  - Bottom Plates, Place of Manufacture of, *May 1*, 861.
  - German Programme, Increase in, *Apr. 25*, 257.
  - Stokers, Proposals for Increasing Supply of, *Apr. 24*, 24.
  - "Swiftsure" and "Triumph," Reserve Guns for, *Apr. 24*, 30.

Robertson, Mr. J. M. [Northumberland, Tyneside]
- Army Engineering Staff, Proposals for Improving Position of, *May 6*, 1328.
- Egypt
  - Administration—Cause for Dismissal of Officials, *Apr. 25*, 266.
  - Civil Service
    - Board for Selection of Candidates, Information as to, *Apr. 25*, 267.
    - Syrians in, *Apr. 25*, 267.
  - Date Tax, Abolition of, Proposed, *Apr. 30*, 695.
  - Denshawai Village, Law Authorising Penalty Inflicted on, *Apr. 30*, 694.
  - Factories and Mines, Introduction of Legislation to deal with, proposed, *Apr. 30*, 695.
- Natal—Alleged Interference by Government in Libel Action by Dinizulu, *May 6*, 1334.
- Postal Parcels, Registered—Rule as to Sealing, *May 1*, 869.

Robertson, Mr. J. M.—*cont.*
- Soudan
  - Christian Missions, Danger of Conflict among Natives involved in Official Encouragement of, *May 25*, 266, 267.
  - Civil Service, Syrians in, *Apr. 25*, 267.
- Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed. *Q.* Mr. John O'Connor ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 2*, 1046.

Roche, Mr. A. [Cork]
- Cattle, Irish, Allegations as to Fraudulent Sale of Inferior English Animals as—Measures proposed for Prevention, *Apr. 24*, 49.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]
- Bagot Estate, Sale Proposals for, *Apr. 24*, 58.
- Ffrench Estate, Purchase Proposals for, *Apr. 24*, 49.
- Galway County Council Grant, Information as to Deduction from, *May 6*, 1313.

Rockchapel
- Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed.
  - *Q.* Mr. Flynn ; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 2*, 1037.

Roscommon
- Intimidatory Processions, etc., in, Instructions to Police for Dealing with.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale ; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 874.

Rosyth Naval Base
See under Navy.

Royal Bank of Scotland Bill
- *l.* 3R.* *Apr. 29*, 462.
- c. 1R.* *Apr. 30*, 662.

Royal Insurance Company
- *l.* Royal Assent, *Apr. 29*, 461.

Rule Committee Bill
- *l. Com.** *Apr. 24*, 3.
  - 3R.* *Apr. 25*, 227.

Runciman, Mr. W.—*Financial Secretary to the Treasury* [Dewsbury]
- Agriculture Board Staff, Salaries of, *Apr. 29*, 537.
- Ancient Monuments, Preservation of—Criticisms on Policy of Board of Works, *May 2*, 1127.
- Antrim Income-tax Appeals, Place of Hearing in the North, *Apr. 24*, 64.
- Arklow Harbour Works, Progress made with, *May 2*, 1128.

[*cont.*

Runciman, Mr. W.—*cont.*
  Arterial Drainage, Failure of Board of Works to Deal with, *May 2*, 1128, 1129.
  Bank of Ireland
    Act Constituting as Government Banker, *May 6*, 1318.
    Balances to Credit of Government in, Disposal of Interest on, *Apr. 30*, 711.
  Bann River Drainage Scheme, Date of Proceeding with, *May 2*, 1129.
  Beer, Ingredients Used in, *May 2*, 1068.
  British Museum Reading-room, Redecoration of—Method of Calling for Tenders, *Apr. 25*, 281.
  Civil Service
    Age for Retirement, *Apr. 29*, 507.
    Irish Offices, Promotion and Salaries in, *Apr. 30*, 712.
    Second Division Clerks entering under Order of 21st March, 1890, Statistics as to, *Apr. 29*, 508.
  Civil Service Estimates
    Class 3, Vote 14, Sub-head F., Supply of Details under, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 249.
    Irish Votes, Unexpended, Amounts saved on since 1903—Allocation of Money, *May 2*, 1040.
  Congo Free State Baptist Mission, Complaints by, *May 6*, 1346.
  Customs and Excise
    Promotions, Special, in Customs Department since 1891, *May 6*, 1318.
    Statistical Department Clerks
      Appointment and Promotions of, *May 1*, 858.
      Reply to Memorial from, *Apr. 24*, 25.
    Watchers, Overtime Payment of, *Apr. 25*, 248.
  Dredgers, Regulations as to Provision of, in Ireland, *May 2*, 1127.
  Dublin
    County Grant—Amount Deducted in Respect of Land Purchase Transactions, *May 6*, 1355.
    Parks, Rate of Wages Paid to Men Employed in, *May 2*, 1139.
    Phœnix Park Regulations as to Grounds Allotted to Football Clubs, *May 2*, 1128.
    Treasury Remembrancer's Office—Salary and Appointments of Mr. J. T. Drennan, *Apr. 29*, 542.
    Valuation Office, Promotion System in, *Apr. 26*, 381.
  Education, Ireland—School Building Plans, Delay in Sanctioning, *May 2*, 1128.

Runciman, Mr. W.—*cont.*
  Exchequer and Audit Department—Political Influence, use of, to Advance Promotion, etc.—Reason for Issue of Order, *Apr. 24*, 25.
  Foreign Office Messengers Appointed in 1906–7, *Apr. 29*, 529.
  Government Departments
    Manufactured Articles obtained from Abroad (1893–1906), *May 1*, 858.
    Saturday Half-holiday Regulations, *Apr. 25*, 280, 281; *May 6*, 1317.
  Greystones Harbour Works, Proposals as to, *May 2*, 1127, 1128.
  Hague Conference—British Delegates' Powers as to Question of Limitations of Armaments, *Apr. 24*, 33.
  Houses in Each Province of Ireland, Valued at £2 or Less, *May 3*, 1171.
  Income Tax
    Ireland, Issue of Statement as to Collection in, proposed, *Apr. 26*, 376.
    Police Pensions, Liability of, *May 2*, 1069.
    Schedule E.—Practice as to Servants of English Companies resident Abroad, *Apr. 26*, 382.
    Small Shareholders who are also Employees, Scale of Payment for, *Apr. 30*, 705.
    Swinburn, Green and Herron, Messrs. Reason for Refusal of Re-Payment of Interest to, *Apr. 29*, 536.
  Labourers Acts Funds, Effect on, of Deficiencies occasioned by Land Purchase Finance, *May 2*, 1077.
  Land Act, 1903
    Guarantee Fund, Sums Drawn from and Repaid to since 1903, *May 1*, 1041.
    Treasury Rules, Amendments proposed to be Made in, *May 2*, 1043.
  Land Purchase
    Financial Working, Inquiry into—Opportunity for Discussion, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 64.
    Funds
      Amount Lying in Banks without Interest, *Apr. 24*, 65, 67.
      Deficiency in—Expenditure of Sum paid from Development Grant, *May 2*, 1043.
    Moneys, Bank Authorised to Receive, *Apr. 30*, 676.
    Stock
      Amount Issued to 31st March, *May 2*, 1043.
      Loss of £102,000, Information as to, *Apr. 29*, 544.
      Regulations as to Payment of Interest, *Apr. 29*, 543.

[*cont.*

Runciman, Mr. W.—*cont.*
  Land Purchase—*cont.*
    Uneconomic Holdings, Means of Paying Rent on and Application of Rule in Blake Foster Case, to Purchase of, *May 1*, 892.
  Law Courts, Ireland, Interest on Securities Held on Behalf of Suitors in Supreme Court, *Apr. 30*, 713.
  Marine Works Act, Expenditure Under, *May 2*, 1127.
  "Mikado," Reason for Withdrawal of Licence for, *Apr. 29*, 529, 530.
  Mining Operations Under the Sea, Crown Leases Required for, *Apr. 30*, 704.
  National Physical Laboratory
    Fees Received for Work Previously Done at Kew, *Apr. 29*, 537.
    Inquiry, Scope of, and Evidence to be Taken by, *Apr. 24*, 40; *Apr. 25*, 279, 280.
  New Hebrides, Arms and Spirits, Regulation of Traffic in, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 33.
  Persia, Progress of Anglo-Russian Negotiations as to, *May 1*, 867.
  Rifle Clubs—Rook-Shooting, Permitting Without Taking out of Gun Licence, proposed, *May 2*, 1069.
  Russo-Japanese War—Result of Negotiations as to British Vessels Sunk by Russian Cruisers, *May 1*, 868.
  Taxation—*Status* of Surveyors' Clerks, *May 2*, 1070.
  Turkey
    Customs Increase, Progress of Negotiations as to, *Apr. 29*, 530.
    Salonica—Capture of Mr. Abbott by Brigands.
      Ransom, Repayment of by Turkish Government, *May 6*, 1344, 1345.
    Uskub—Attack on Mr. Heathcote Smith by Albanians, *May 6*, 1345.
  Valuation in Ireland Per Inhabitant, Per County, *Apr. 26*, 378.
  Westmeath—Death Duty Grant, Amount Deducted from, *Apr. 24*, 68.
  Whitburn Beach, Date of Discontinuing to Tip Colliery Refuse on, *Apr. 30*, 705.
  Works Board.
    Administration by, Alleged Failure by, *May 2*, 1126.
    Constitution of—Qualifications and Salaries of Members, *May 2*, 1129, 1130.
    Loans, Facilities for Granting Smaller Loans, proposed, *May 2*, 1127.
    Religious Opinions of Staff—Treatment of Roman Catholics, *May 2*, 1130–1133.

Runciman, Mr. W.—*cont.*
  Works Board—*cont.*
    Statements Made by Employees to Members, or to the Press, Penalties for, *May 2*, 1131.
    Staff — Information as to certain Officers, *May 6*, 1354.

Russell, Mr. T. W. [Tyrone, S.]
  Clogher Courthouse—Reason for Refusal of use for Concert, *Apr. 29*, 494.

Russia
  British Fleet, Projected Visit of, in May.
    Q. Mr. Thorne; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 2*, 1059.

Russo-Japanese War
  British Vessels sunk by Russian Cruisers—Result of Negotiations as to Claims for Compensation.
    Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 1*, 867, 868.

Rutherford, Dr. V. H. [Middlesex, Brentford]
  Egypt
    Children, Destitute, Provision of Homes for, proposed, *May 2*, 1060.
  Sanitation, Improvement of, proposed *May 2*, 1060.
  India
    Madras High Court Puisne Judgeships, Claims of Indian Lawyers to, *Apr. 24*, 16.
    Plague Reports of College of Physicians, Action taken on, *Apr. 29*, 499.
  Macedonian Vilayets, Reports received on Condition of, *Apr. 25*, 263.
  Transvaal
    Chinese Labour—Circumstances of admitting Unlicensed Coolies, *May 6*, 1336.
    Registration Bill, Provisions of and, Proposals as to, *May 2*, 1058.

Rutherford, Mr. W. W. [Liverpool, West Derby]
  Navy
    Portsmouth Dockyard, Lock, New, Proposals as to Construction of, *Apr. 25*, 332, 333, 334.
    Rosyth, Policy as to, *Apr. 25*, 333, 334.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Financial Resolution, Exemption of from Closure, proposed, *May 6*, 1422.

St. Lucia Riots
  British Warships within two Days Steam of the Island.
    Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. E. Robertson, *Apr. 29*, 498.

[*cont.*

St. Lucia Riots—*cont.*
Information as to, and Measures taken to restore Order.
Qs. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Mr. Lonsdale, Viscount Turnour; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 29*, 528, 529.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray, Sir G. Parker; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 2*, 1055, 1056.

Salisbury, Bishop of
Companies Bill, *Com.*, *May 2*, 1027.

Salisbury, Marquess of
Army—Territorial Force.
Drill—Minimum Annual Requirements, *Apr. 29*, 485, 486.
Regulations or Orders in Council—Submitting Specimen Draft to the House, proposed, *Apr. 29*, 485.

Salmon Fisheries
Ireland—Constitution of Advisory Committee, Representation of Lessees of Private Fisheries, etc.
Q. Mr. Barrie; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 29*, 509, 510.

Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Bill
l. 2R., *Apr. 29*, 472.

Samuel, Mr. H. L.—*Under-Secretary, Home Office* [Yorkshire, Cleveland]
Limited Partnerships Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1198.

Sandgate
Jones's Homes, Religious Ministrations provided for.
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 29*, 532, 533.

Sarsfield Estate
Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants, Proposals for.
Qs. Captain Donelan; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 61.

Sassoon, Sir E. A. [Hythe]
Colonial Conference, 1907, Proceedings, Decision as to Publishing, *May 1*, 896.
Gold Standard Reserve, Position and Extent of, *Apr. 25*, 232.
Sandgate—Religious Ministrations provided for Jones's Homes, *Apr. 29*, 532.
Tea Duty, Reduction of, to 4d. per pound, proposed, *May 1*, 918–920.

Savings Banks
See Post Office Savings Bank, *and titles* Army and Navy.

Scarisbrick, Mr. T. L. [Dorset, S.]
Portland—Damage done to Lobster Fishery by Firing Practice, *Apr. 25*, 245.

Schwann, Mr. C. D. [Cheshire, Hyde]
Nantwich Post Office—Employment of Relation of Postmaster, *May 2*, 1046.

Schwann, Sir C. E. [Manchester, N.]
Ceylon Coolie Children, Facilities for Education of, *Apr. 30*, 692.
Natal British Indian Traders—Inquiry into Refusal of Licences proposed, *Apr. 30*, 693.
Tea Duty, Reduction of, to 4d. per Pound, proposed, *May 1*, 920.

Scotland
Secretary for—Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.
Lord Advocate—Rt. Hon. T. Shaw.
Solicitor-General—Mr. A. Ure.
[*For* particular Places, *see their Names.*]
Church Property Dispute—Allocation of Churches by Commission.
Qs. Mr. J. C. Wason; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 2*, 1071.
Court of Session
Appeals, *see under* Law Courts.
Extractor's Department, Application of Session Clerks Act to.
Q. Mr. Watt; *A.* Mr. Shaw, *Apr. 29*, 541.
Crofters Commission, Land acquired by and Work of.
Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 2*, 1044.
Education, *see that title.*
Parish Electors, Information as to
Q. Mr. Younger; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 25*, 283.

Scott, Mr. A. H. [Ashton-under-Lyne]
Sugar Duties, Desirability of Remitting, *May 1*, 868.
Transvaal Chinese Labour—Circumstances of Landing of Unlicensed Coolies, *May 2*, 1057; *May 6*, 1336.

Scott, Sir S. E. [Marylebone, W.]
Cabs—Negotiations as to Privilege Cab System, *Apr. 25*, 271.
Messengers in Government Departments Appointed in 1906–7, *Apr. 25*, 288; *Apr. 29*, 501, 541; *Apr. 30*, 529, 676, 681; *May 1*, 846.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Constitution and Duties of County Associations, *Apr. 29*, 523.

Sears, Mr. J. E. [Cheltenham]
Income Tax
Collection—Assimilating System to that prevailing in Scotland, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 104.
Earned Incomes—Burden of Proof to rest with the Claimant and Claim to be made together with the Return, etc., *Apr. 24*, 105.
Inland Revenue Department—Necessity for Reorganisation of, *Apr. 24*, 105.

cont.

Seaweed
Scotland—Rights of certain Landlords to claim Seaweed as private Property.
Qs. Mr. J. C. Wason, Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 6*, 1353, 1354.

Seaverns, Mr. J. H [Lambeth, Brixton]
Customs and Excise, Statistical Department Clerks, Appointment and Promotions of, *May 1*, 858.

Secretary of State for the Colonies
Rt. Hon. Earl of Elgin.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
Rt. Hon. Sir E. Grey.

Secretary of State for the Home Department
Rt. Hon. H. Gladstone.

Secretary of State for India
Rt. Hon. J. Morley.

Secretary for Scotland
Rt. Hon. J. Sinclair.

Secretary of State for War
Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.

Seddon, Mr. J. W. [Lancashire, Newton]
Shop Hours Act, Failure of—Necessity for more drastic Legislation with Regard to closing of Shops and Hours of Shop Assistants, *May 1*, 964–968.

Seeley, Col. J. E. B. [Liverpool, Abercromby]
Coastguard Inquiry—Action to be taken on Report, *Apr. 30*, 682.
Superannuation—Reckoning Army and Navy Service with Civil Service Time, *Apr. 26*, 386.
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Allocation of Time to Various Stages, Proposals as to, *May 6*, 1407, 1408.
Transvaal Chinese Labour—Circumstances of admitting unlicensed Coolies and Proposals for Repatriation, *May 2*, 1058; *May 6*, 1342.

Selsey Water Bill
l. Rep. Apr. 30*, 629.

Session
See under Parliamentary Procedure.

Sewerage Board Bill
l. Rep. Apr. 30*, 629.

Shackleton, Mr. D. [Lancashire, N.E., Clitheroe]
Shop Hours Act, Failure of—Necessity for more Drastic Legislation with Regard to Closing of Shops and Hours of Shop Assistants, *May 1*, 960–964.
Shop Hours Bill, 1904, Attitude of Sir F. Banbury towards, *May 1*, 976, 992.

Shanklin Gas Bill
c. Con. Apr. 29*, 488.
3R.* *May 3*, 1165.
l. 1R.* *May 6*, 1202.

Shaw, Rt. Hon. T.—*Lord Advocate* [Hawick Burghs]
Court of Session Extractor's Department, Application of Sessions Clerks Act to, *Apr. 29*, 541.
Intestate Husband's Estate (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *May 3*, 1188–1190.
Law Courts, Scotland—Reduction in Time for Appeals from Court of Session to House of Lords, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 43.
Licensing (Scotland) Act, 1903—Interpretation of Section 106, *May 6*, 1308.
Lord Advocate *v.* Colonel Balfour—Government Acquiescence in Decision, *May 6*, 1308.
Motherwell—Cross Keys Public House, Holder of Certificate for, *May 2*, 1047.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 717, 723–734, 799.

Sheehan, Mr. D. D. [Cork County, Mid.)
Government Departments—Saturday Half-holiday Regulations, *Apr. 25*, 280.
Inchinasingane, Rent Recovery Proceedings in Bankruptcy Courts, Custom as to, *Apr. 24*, 63.
Kilmallock Labourers' Cottages Applications, Rejection of, *Apr. 25*, 234.
Knocklong Labourers' Cottage Applications, Complaints as to manner of dealing with, *Apr. 24*, 50.
Leader Estate—Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. A. Connell, *Apr. 30*, 670.

Sheehy, Mr. D. [Meath, S.]
Fay Estates, Application of Section 40 of Land Act, 1896, *Apr. 24*, 52.

Sheffield, Sir B. [Yorkshire, W.R., Osgoldcross]
Colmanstown—Outrage at House of Mr. Smith, *May 1*, 880.
Killarney—Attack on Lord Kenmare's Bailiffs on 27th April, *May 1*, 886.

Sheriffs
Allowances to, for Expenses in Connection with Elections and the Entertainment of Judges and Recorders.
Q. Mr. Steadman; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 25*, 240, 241.

Sheriffs Court Civil Procedure Bill
Second Reading, Date of taking.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 25*, 256.

Sherwell, Mr. [Huddersfield]
Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill 2R., *Apr. 26*, 421–429.

Shop Hours Act
Failure of—Necessity for more Drastic Legislation with regard to Closing of Shops and Hours of Shop Assistants.
Os. Mr. Shackleton, *May 1*, 960–964; Mr. Seddon, 964–968; Mr. Gladstone, 968–972; Sir C. Dilke, 972; Mr. A. C. Corbett, 973, Mr. Davies, 974; Sir F. Banbury, 974–978; Mr. J. D. White, 977; Mr. Hunt, 978.
Orders made under, Presented, *Apr. 24*, 2. 6; *Apr. 29*, 464, 488; *May 2*, 995, 1035.
Return as to Closing Orders made in United Kingdom (1906–7), Ordered, *May 2*, 1035.

Shop Hours Bill, 1904
Attitude of Sir F. Banbury towards.
Os. Mr. Shackleton, *May 1*, 976, 992; Sir F. Banbury, 976, 977, 992; Viscount Turnour, 992.

Shotley Hospital
Increase of Accommodation in, proposed.
Os. Mr. Lambert, *Apr. 25*, 297.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*Secretary for Scotland* [Forfarshire]
Aberdeenshire—Cause for Extension of Sporting Grounds on Estates of Mr. Heaven and Mr. Coats, *May 6*, 1352.
Beauly and Ness Rivers, Fishery Rights claimed in, *May 6*, 1351.
Beith Academy, *Status* of, *Apr. 24*, 42.
Castleton—Inquiry as to need for Small Holdings, proposed, *May 6*, 1352.
Church Property Dispute—Allocation of Churches by Commission, *May 2*, 1071.
Congested Districts Board
  Horse Breeding Schemes—Inspection of Stallions, *May 2*, 1045.
  Land acquired by and New Holdings formed, etc., *May 2*, 1044.
Crofters' Commission, Land acquired by and Work of, *May 2*, 1044.
Dairies, Inspection of, *Apr. 30*, 708, 709.
Dumbarton
  Church Property Trust, Disposal of, *May 6*, 1317.
  Sewage Works—Proposals as to Inquiry, *May 2*, 1072.
Dunnet Bay, Illegal Trawling in—Date of last Visit of Cruiser, *May 1*, 870.
Forth, Firth of—Damage done to Fish by method of discharging Dredgings, *Apr. 29*, 540.
Lanarkshire, Illegitimacy Statistics in, *Apr. 29*, 540.

Sinclair, Rt. Hon. J.—*cont.*
Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26*, 434–435.
Messengers appointed to Government Offices, *Apr. 29*, 541.
Moray Firth, Foreign Trawlers observed and examined in, *Apr. 30*, 708.
Paisley—Identity of Workmen' employed in Alterations to Licensed Premises, *Apr. 29*, 540.
Plunkett, Sir H.—Offer of Position of Scottish Agricultural Commissioner, proposed, *Apr. 29*, 541.
Seaweed, Right of certain Landlords to claim as Private Property, *May 6*, 1354.
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 557, 572; *Apr. 30*, 750, 762–771, 799.
Sutherland—Dog Poisoning near Badininish, *May 6*, 1353.

Skibbereen
Drimoleague Dispensary Doctor, Circumstances of Election of—Allegations as to Corruption.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 879.

Sligo
District Lunatic Asylum—Cases of C. Mullen and C. McDonagh.
Q. Mr. McHugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 871, 872.
Grants, Deductions from, in Respect of Land Purchase.
Qs. Mr. McHugh; *As.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30*, 663, 664, 667, 668, 706, 707; *May 1*, 890.

Sloan, Mr. T. H. [Belfast, S.]
Administration, Legislative Proposals as to, *Apr. 24*, 55.
Deaf Mutes, Emigration to Colonies—Power of Colonial Governments to Prohibit Landing, *Apr. 24*, 31.
Downpatrick Rural District Council—Resolution as to Sales of Old Clothes from Belfast on Fair Days, *Apr. 25*, 255.
Dublin Metropolitan Police—Reason for comparative Paucity of Protestants, *Apr. 24*, 21.
Killarney Lake—Boats, Regulations for Licensing, etc., *Apr. 24*, 56.
Newtownards, Woman charged with Larceny, Cause of supply of Whisky to, *Apr. 24*, 26.
Roman Catholic University, Legislative Proposals for—Protests received from Universities and Colleges, *Apr. 24*, 52.
Tipperary Constabulary Force, Religion of, *Apr. 24*, 21.

Small Holdings

Act of 1892, Failure of.
Os. Marquess of Ripon, *Apr. 25*, 207.

Allotments and Small Holdings, Necessity for Distinguishing in Papers, etc., relating to.
Os. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, *Apr. 25*, 213, 214.

Circular issued by County Councils—Tabling Answers received to, proposed.
Os. Earl of Camperdown, *Apr. 25*, 219–222; Earl Carrington, 221; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 221.

Crown Lands, Experiments made with.
Os. Earl Carrington, *Apr. 25*, 201, 202; Earl of Onslow, 203; Earl of Crewe, 216.

Demand for—Substantiation of Allegations as to Attitude of Landowners, etc., proposed.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *Apr. 25*, 186, 190–193, 218; Earl Carrington, 196–203; Earl of Onslow, 204–207; Marquess of Ripon, 209.
Os. Marquess of Londonderry, *Apr. 25*, 210–213; Lord Balfour of Burleigh, 213, 214.
Qs. Mr. Lane-Fox; *As.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 24*, 10, 11, 70, 71.

Memorandum of Evidence Presented, *May 2*, 994; *May 6*, 1301.

Experiments made by Earl of Carrington, Statement as to, proposed.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *Apr. 25*, 192–194; Earl Carrington, 197.

Official Returns as to—Tabling fuller Information, proposed.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *Apr. 25*, 190, 219; Earl Carrington, 195; Marquess of Londonderry, 211.

Papers relating to, Date of Tabling.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *May 2*, 995; Earl Carrington, 996.

Report and Recommendations of Committee of Inquiry.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *Apr. 25*, 191, 192; Earl of Onslow, 205; Earl of Crewe, 215.

Speech by Prime Minister at Holborn Restaurant, Terms of.
Os. Marquess of Lansdowne, *Apr. 25*, 185–190, 218; Earl Carrington, 196, 203; Marquess of Ripon, 208; Marquess of Londonderry, 210, 212; Earl of Crewe, 214, 215.

Small Holdings (No. 3) Bill

c. Order for Second Reading Read and Bill withdrawn, *May 6*, 1364.

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill

c. 2R., *Apr. 29*, 547, 615; *Apr. 30*, 715.

Debate on Second Reading [Commons]; *Apr. 29*, 547; *Apr. 30*, 715.

Afforestation, Land Available for, 549, 550.

Assistance to New Tenants, Proposals as to, 721, 722, 758.

Borrowing Powers of Small Landholders, 739.

Compulsory Powers for Acquisition of Land, Proposals as to, 558, 757–760, 767, 808.

Consideration of Bill by Committee of the Whole House, proposed, 557.

Deer Forests, Breaking up to provide Small Holdings, proposed, 622, 623, 734, 794.

Distribution of Land in Scotland, 726, 727.

Dual Ownership, Objections to, 548, 555, 556, 561, 571, 572, 580, 588, 594, 740, 742, 777, 790, 797, 800.

English Bill, Information as to Provisions of, 552, 557.

Eviction, Arbitrary, Cases of, 716, 717, 718.

Fair Rent fixing, Proposals as to, 739, 787, 792, 796.

Financial Proposals of the Bill, 552 553, 556, 569, 570, 587, 588, 619, 722, 793.

Land available for, 734, 735, 803–805.

Land Court, proposed Establishment of, 554, 555, 557, 562, 580, 583, 584, 619, 620, 719, 720.
Estimate of Cost of, 554, 566.

Landlords' Rights over Tenants' Land, 564, 597, 617, 725, 740, 741.

Local Authorities, Extension of Powers of, proposed, 551, 552.

March Fences, Question as to Payment for Erection of, 738.

New Holdings, Proposals as to Creation of, 560, 573, 583, 588, 622, 720, 791, 808–810,

Penalties to be Imposed on Tenants failing to carry out Agreement, 565.

Purchase Scheme, desirability of Introducing, 727–733, 772, 778, 789, 793, 796, 810.

Responsible Ownership, Necessity for Establishing Principle of, 548, 553, 558, 561, 564–566.

Resumption of Holdings by Landlord on Expiry of Leases, Provisions as to, 593, 755.

[*cont.*

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill—*cont.*
  Debate on Second Reading [Commons]—*cont.*
    Rural Depopulation in Scotland, Extent of, 548, 549, 568, 569, 578, 585, 586, 595, 596, 747, 748, 726, 763, 779, 780, 782, 795, 799.
    Security of Tenure for Existing Holders, Proposals as to, 562, 563, 565, 621, 622, 626, 765, 769, 771, 772, 783, 785, 786, 796, 797, 800.
      Reasons for Limiting to Holdings below £50, 556, 558, 587, 622, 749, 750, 751, 787.
    Worcestershire Colony, Success of Experiment, 774, 775.

Smeaton, Mr. D. M. [Stirlingshire]
  Africa East—Charge against and Identity of, Capt. Grogan, etc., *May 6*, 1333.
  Castleton—Inquiry as to Need for Small Holdings, proposed, *May 6*, 1352.
  Education Committee of Privy Council—Publication of Names and of Dates of Meetings, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 290.
  Income Tax on Earned Incomes, Position of Pensions, Annuities, etc., *Apr. 24*, 125–127.
  India
    Arbuthnot & Co., Insolvency of—Investigation proposed, *Apr. 25*, 258.
    Legislative Councils—Opportunity for Discussing Proposals, *Apr. 25*, 258.

Smith, Mr. F. E. [Liverpool, Walton]
  Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 26*, 394–403.
  Tea Duty, Reduction of, to 4d. per Pound, proposed, *May 1*, 926–928.

Smythe, Col., Estate of
  Reinstatement of Evicted Tenants—Case of E. Fagan, etc.
    Q. Mr. Ginnell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 43.

Snowden, Mr. P. [Blackburn]
  Income Tax—Super-Tax on Incomes Over £2,000, proposed, *Apr. 24*, 81.
  Old-Age Pensions—Government Proposals, *Apr. 24*, 79, 81.
  Social Reform, Failure of the Government to Deal With, *Apr. 24*, 76–82.

Soares, Mr. E. J. [Devon, Barnstaple]
  Business Committee, Establishment of, proposed, *May 6*, 1404.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Allocation of Time to Various Stages, Proposals as to, *May 6*, 1402.

Social Reform
  Failure of the Government to Deal With Question.
    Os. Mr. Snowden, *Apr. 24*, 76–82.

Society of Apothecaries of London Bill
  c. 2R.* *Apr. 29*, 488.

Solicitor General—*Sir W. S. Robson*

Solicitor-General for Ireland—*Mr. R. Barry.*

Solicitor-General for Scotland—*Mr. A. Ure*

Soudan
  Bahr-el-Ghazal—Date of Evacuation by Congolese Troops.
    Qs. Mr. Lonsdale; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 264.
  Christian Missions, Danger of Conflict among Natives Involved in Official Encouragement.
    Qs. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 266, 267.
  Civil Service, Syrians in.
    Q. Mr. J. M. Robertson; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 267.

South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill
  c. 3R.* *Apr. 29*, 487.
  l. 1R.* *Apr. 30*, 630.

South Wales Mineral Railway Bill
  l. 2R.* *May 1*, 821.

Southend Water Bill
  l. *Rep.** *Apr. 25*, 177.
    3R.* *Apr. 30*, 629.
  c. 1R.* *May 1*, 841.

Southport, Birkdale and West Lancashire Water Board Bill
  l. *Rep.** *May 2*, 993.

Speaker and Deputy Speaker, Rulings of
  Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Treatment of by Standing Committee, *Apr. 25*, 273.
  Committees, Standing
    Scottish.
      Appointment of Members, Wording of Notification as to, *Apr. 30*, 715.
      Reference of Bills to be Within the Discretion of the Speaker, *May 3*, 1190.
    System of Summoning, *Apr. 25*, 272.
  Explanation Must not Exceed the Limits of a Personal One, *Apr. 29*, 628.
  Personal Explanation, Matters Relevant to, *May 1*, 897.
  Second Speech Could not be Made on Second Reading of Bill Unless it were a Personal Explanation, *May 6*, 1438.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Financial Resolution, Opportunity for Discussion of Under Closure Resolution, *May 6*, 1423.

Spirits

Duty on, Incidence of.
Os. Mr. A. Cross, *May 1*, 945.

Estimate of Cost to Distillers of Revenue Restrictions, Basis of Calculating.
Q. Mr. Mitchell-Thomson; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 29*, 508.

Excise Duties on, Continuance of.
Resolution Reported, *May 1*, 903.

Plain Spirit Imported During Last Twenty Years—Duty Paid, etc.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *Apr. 25*, 249, 250.

Springtown

Reinstatement Claim of Mrs. A. Smyth.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 883.

Standing Committees

See under Committees.

Standing Orders

Appeals, Amendment of Standing Orders, Nos. I., V., VIII., and X.
Motion (Lord Loreburn) *May 6*, 1295–1298.

Stanger, Mr. H. Y. [Kensington, N.]

Colonial Conference 1907—Decision as to Publishing Proceedings, *May 6*, 1360.

Rhodesia—Complaints Against Chartered Company, *Apr. 30*, 687.

Staveley Coal and Iron Company Bill

c. 2R.* *Apr. 29*, 488.

Steadman, Mr. W. C. [Finsbury, Central]

"Hyson," S.S., Cause of Fatal Accident to Meakin, and Proposals for preventing Similar Accidents, *Apr. 25*, 241.

Post Office Sorters—Proposals for abolishing Open Competition, *Apr. 26*, 376.

Post Office, Eastern District—Full-time Casual Sorters employed, *Apr. 25*, 243.

Sheriffs, Allowances to for Election Expenses and Entertainment of Judges, etc., *Apr. 25*, 240.

Telegraph Service—Ex-Soldiers, Proposals for employing, *Apr. 24*, 7.

Stewart, Mr. H. [Greenock]

Transvaal Chinese Labour—Circumstances of admitting, *May 6*, 1337.

Strachey, Sir E. [Somerset, S.]

Agriculture

Area under Cultivation in certain Foreign Countries, *Apr. 25*, 248; *Apr. 29*, 504.

Strachey, Sir E.—*cont.*

Agriculture—*cont.*

Classes, etc., assisted by Board of Education, *Apr. 25*, 279.

Instruction, Terms of Reference of Inquiry into, *Apr. 25*, 278.

Irish Department, Work of—Inspection of by English Departmental Committee, proposed, *Apr. 30*, 705, 706.

Agriculture and Fisheries Grant, Increase of, proposed, *May 6*, 1311.

Alderney Abattoir, Decision as to, *Apr. 25*, 246.

Burwell Farm, Expenditure on adapting to Requirements of Small Holders, *May 2*, 1070, 1071.

Butter and Margarine Bill—Effect on Salt Firkin Butter, *May 2*, 1077.

Crown Lands Agency, Reason for Changes in, *Apr. 24*, 41.

Edinburgh Grassmarket, Legality of holding Cattlemarket in, *May 6*, 1310.

Kew Gardens

Cambridge Cottage, Utilisation of, *May 2*, 1045.

Guide-books, etc., Right to Sell, *May 2*, 1045.

Meat Imports from Argentina and United States in 1906, *May 1*, 857.

Ordnance Maps—Designation of Catholic Places of Worship in Ireland, *Apr. 30*, 675.

Portsmouth, Earl of—Allegations as to Harsh Treatment of Tenant, *Apr. 29*, 538.

Straus, Mr. B. S. [Tower Hamlets, Mile End]

London Municipal Society, London and North-Western Railway Subscription to, *Apr. 25*, 368.

London and North Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 368.

Streets

Tearing-up of, Proposals for Regulating.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 24*, 70.

Traffic Board, Proposals for Establishing.
Q. Sir W. Bull; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 24*, 69, 70.

Sugar Duties

Remitting, Desirability of.
Q. Mr. Scott; *A.* Mr. Asquith, *May 1*, 868.

Revenue derived from and Proposals as to.
Os. Mr. C. Money, *Apr. 24*, 118.

Summerbell, Mr. T. [Sunderland]

Calico, Dressing used in Manufacturing—Cause of Death of Ann Wilson, *Apr. 30*, 696.

Easington Poor Law Guardians, Co-option of Member by, *May 2*, 1065.

Hartlepool—Teaching of Rifle Shooting at Halley's Field Upper School, *Apr. 30*, 702.

Ipswich Poor Law Labour Yard, Reason for Closing, *May 2*, 1047.

Kew Gardens

Cambridge Cottage, Utilisation of, *May 2*, 1045.

Guide-books, etc., Right to Sell, *May 2*, 1045.

Local Authorities—Workmen's Compensation Act, Application of, to Employees, *May 2*, 1047.

Newark Poor Law Guardians, Wages paid by, to Persons seeking Employment, *May 2*, 1048.

Trinidad

Couva Riots, Information as to, *Apr. 30*, 688.

Import Duty on Swedish Matches, Effect of Reduction in, *Apr. 30*, 688.

Tynemouth Poor Law Guardians, Co-option of Member by, *May 2*, 1065.

Whitburn Beach, Date of Discontinuing to tip Colliery Refuse on, *Apr. 30*, 705.

Superannuation

Appointment Without Certificate—Minute Presented, *May 6*, 1203, 1301.

Army and Navy Non-Pensionable Service, Decision as to Reckoning with Civil Service time.
Q. Major Seely; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 26*, 386.

Surrey

Parliamentary Election for Wimbledon Division—New Writ Issued, *Apr. 29*, 487.

Sutherland

Dog-Poisoning in Neighbourhood of Badininish, Danger Arising from.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 25*, 282, 283.
Q. Mr. Morton; *A.* Mr. Sinclair, *May 6*, 1353.

utton Coldfield Rectory Bill

l. 3R.* *May 6*, 1201.

Swansea Harbour Bill

c. Con. Apr. 26*, 373.
3R.* *Apr. 30*, 661.
l. 1R.* *May 1*, 821.

Swine

Irish—Protests against Restrictions on Importation into England.
Q. Mr. Farrell; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 884.

Taff Vale Railway Bill

c. 3R.* *Apr. 26*. 373.
l. 1R.* *Apr. 29*, 461.

Talbot, Lord E. [Sussex, Chichester]

Worthing Gas Bill, *Con. Apr. 29*, 614.

Taxation

Income Tax, *see that title.*

Indirect Incidence of.
Os. Mr. C, Money, *Apr. 24*, 114, 115.

Ireland, incidence of Direct and Indirect Taxation in.
Os. Mr. Dillon, *May 1*, 916–918.

Local

Assigned Revenue intercepted from the Treasury, Abolition of System.
O. Mr. H. Beach, *Apr. 24*, 76; Mr. V. Cavendish, 92, 95; Mr. Asquith, 95; Mr. J. F. Mason, 103; Mr. Bowles, 109, 110.

Grants to, out of Consolidated Fund. *Resolution* [Mr. Runciman], *Apr. 24*, 135.

Surveyors Clerks, *Status* of — Inquiry proposed.
Qs. Mr. Hayden, Mr. C. E. Price; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *May 2*, 1069, 1070.

War Taxes, Possibility of Remitting.
Os. Mr. T. F. Mason, *Apr. 24*, 102; Mr. Harmood-Banner, *May 1*, 931, 932; Sir F. Banbury, 932; Mr. Asquith, 933, 934, 938; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 935; Mr. Rawlinson, 936; Colonel Lockwood, 936; Mr. A. Cross, 937; Mr. Wyndham, 938; Mr. L. Jones, 939; Mr. T. L. Corbett, 940; Mr. C. Craig, 940.

Taximeter Cabs

See under Cabs

Taylor, Mr. A. [Liverpool, East Toxteth]

Transvaal Chinese Labour—Circumstances of Admitting Unlicensed Coolies, *May 6*, 1342,

Taylor, Mr. T. C. [Lancashire, S.E., Radcliffe]

Income Tax

Earned Incomes up to £2,000 to be taxed at 9d. in the £, *Apr. 24*, 131.

Returns, Employers to give Particulars of all Salaries paid, *Apr. 24*, 132.

Old-age Pensions—Government proposals, *Apr. 24*, 132.

Tea

Duty on

Continuance of, at 5d. in the pound, *Resolution* Reported, *May 1*, 903.

Reduction of, to 4d. per pound, proposed.

Os. Mr. Fletcher, *May 1*, 904; Mr. Courthope, 905; Mr. Asquith, 906, 907; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 907–909; Mr. Rees, 909–910; Sir F. Banbury, 910, 911; Mr. J. F. Mason, 911; Captain Craig, 912, 913; Mr. A. Cross, 913–915; Mr. Ashley, 915; Mr. Dillon, 916; Sir E. Sassoon, 918–920; Sir C. Schwann, 920; Sir G. Parker, 921–923; Lord R. Cecil, 923, 924; Mr. C. E. Price, 924; Mr. Mr. H. Beach, 925; F. E. Smith, 926–928.

Remission of, Reason for Refusing.

Os. Mr. H. Beach, *Apr. 24*, 75.

Tees Conservancy Bill

c. 2R.* *Apr. 29*, 488.

Tees Valley Water (Consolidation) Bill

l. Report from Select Committee, *Apr. 30*, 629.

3R.* *May 6*, 1201.

Telegraph Service

See also Names of Places.

Central Office—Decision as to Changes in Duties of Examining Messages.

Q. Mr. Bowerman; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 1*, 846.

Ex-Soldiers, Proposals for Employing.

Qs. Mr. Steadman; *As.* Mr. Buxton, *Apr. 24*, 7, 8.

Tennant, Sir E. P. [Salisbury]

Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 559.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill

Allocation of Time to various Stages, Proposals as to.

Os. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1367–1374; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1374–1380, 1408–1412; Mr. L. Hardy, 1382–1384; Mr. Ashley, 1384; Mr. Wyndham, 1385–1390; Mr. Haldane, 1390–1394; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 1394–1396; Lord R. Cecil, 1396–1399; Mr. Mildmay, 1399–1402; Mr. Soares, 1402; Mr. Bowles, 1406; Major Seely, 1407, 1408; Mr. S. T. Evans, 1412, 1413; Mr. Courthope, 1413–1415; Mr. Markham, 1415, 1416.

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—*cont.*

Allocation of Time, etc.—*cont.*

Resolution [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *May 6*, 1372–1374, 1438–1440, 1463–1466.

Allotted Day

Resolution [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *May 6*, 1373.

Amendments, Effect of Guillotine Resolution on.

Os. Sir C. Dilke, *May 6*, 1380–1382; Mr. J. R. Macdonald, 1394.

Artillery, Proposals as to.

Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, *May 6*, 1378; Mr. Haldane, 1390.

Clauses 5–40, allowing Extra Day for Discussion of, proposed.

Os. Mr. Wyndham, *May 6*, 1451–1453; Mr. Haldane, 1453; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1454.

Cost of the Scheme.

Os. Mr. Haldane, *May 6*, 1446–1448.

County Associations

Constitution and Duties of.

Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29*, 523, 524.

Funds, Expenditure of.

Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 2*, 1054.

Provision of Moneys to be paid to.

Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6*, 1306, 1307.

Expenses—Committee to Authorise Payment out of Money voted for Army Services.

Resolution [Mr. Whiteley], *Apr. 24*, 176.

Financial Proposals in Connection with.

Os. Mr. V. Cavendish, *Apr. 24*, 94, 95.

Financial Resolution, Exemption of from Closure, proposed.

Os. Mr. V. Cavendish, *May 6*, 1419–1422; Mr. W. Rutherford, 1422; Mr. Haldane, 1423, 1446; Captain Craig, 1423, 1440; Sir H. Vincent, 1441; Lord Balcarres, 1441–1443; Sir F. Banbury, 1443; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 1444–1446; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1448.

Increased Estimate, Measures proposed for Showing.

Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6*, 1307.

Lords-Lieutenant, Proposals for Alteration in Conditions of Appointing.

Q. Mr. Whitehead; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1356.

Militia, Regulations as to Enlistment in Special Reserve.

Os. Mr. Wyndham, *May 6*, 1387, 1392; Mr. Haldane, 1392, 1393.

[*cont.*

Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—*cont.*
Reorganisation under, Proposals for Carrying out.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6,* 1329.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]
Coal Mines (Eight Hours) Bill, Procedure with and Proposals as to, *Apr. 25,* 271, 272, 274.
Glamorganshire Schools, Reason for Increase in Cost of Maintaining, *Apr. 25,* 275, 276.
Great Northern and City Railway Bill, *Con., May 6,* 1428.
Welsh Church Commission—Proposals for filling Vacancies, *Apr. 24,* 71.

Thorne, Mr. W. [West Ham, S.]
Chiswick Council Chamber—Action of Police in Case of Councillor O'Brien, *May 2,* 1063.
Russia—British Fleet, Projected Visit of in March, *May 2,* 1059.

Tipperary
Constabulary Force, Religion of.
Q. Mr. Sloan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 21.

Tobacco
Duties on, Continuance of—Resolution Reported, *May 1,* 903.
Ireland—Government Assistance towards Cultivation.
Os. Mr. W. Redmond, *May 1,* 941; Mr. Asquith, 942.

Tomkinson, Mr. J. [Cheshire, Crewe]
Hammersmith — Ecclesiastical Commissioners' Property Leased for Exhibition Purposes—Provision as to Liquor Licence, *Apr. 24,* 41.

Tongalee
Beirne, Mr., Case of.
Q. Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 53.

Torrance, Sir A. M. [Glasgow, Central]
Limited Partnerships Bill, 2R., *May 3,* 1195.

Tottenham Estate
Dolan, Mrs., Case of.
Q. Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 22.

Towns and Cities
Development of—Granting Powers to Local Authorities to lay out Suburbs on Rational Lines.
Os. Mr. P. W. Wilson, *May 1,* 978–982; Mr. Jowett, 982–985; Viscount Turnour, 986; Mr. Burns, 987–990.
Garden Cities and Model Villages, Results of Experiments with.
Os. Mr. P. W. Wilson, *May 1,* 980, 981; Mr. Burns, 988, 989.

Trade, Board of
President—Rt. Hon. D. Lloyd-George.
Parliamentary Secretary—Mr. H. E. Kearley.

Trade Reports
Annual Series Presented, *Apr. 24,* 6; *Apr. 25,* 178; *Apr. 29,* 463, 489; *May 2,* 995, 1035; *May 6,* 1202, 1300.
Miscellaneous Series, Presented, *Apr. 24,* 6; *Apr. 25,* 178.

Trade and Commerce
British Possessions and Foreign Countries—Annual Statement, *May 1,* 822, 843.
Inter-Imperial Trade Statistics—Return Presented, *Apr. 29,* 489.
Irish Trade Statistics, *see under* Ireland.

Tramways
Brakes for Street Cars—Mode of Investigation into Matter.
Q. Mr. Bell; *A.* Mr. Kearley, *Apr. 25,* 278.

Tramways Orders Confirmation Bill
l. 1R.* *May 1,* 821.

Transvaal
Chinese Labourers
Repatriation, Expenditure on and Number effected.
Qs. Viscount Turnour, Sir G. Parker, Captain Craig, Mr. Mitchell-Thomson, Viscount Helmsley; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 6,* 1334, 1335.
Statistics as to Number employed and Importation in 1907.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 30,* 692.
Unlicensed Coolies, Circumstances of Landing and Proposals for dealing with.
Os. Mr. Walsh, Mr. Speaker *May 2,* 1084.
Qs. Mr. Walsh, Mr. Scott, Sir B. Gurdon, Major Seely, Lord Balcarres, Mr. Crooks; *As.* Mr. Churchill, Mr. Speaker, *May 2,* 1056–1058.
Qs. Mr. J. Ward, Mr. G. Greenwood, Mr. Scott, Mr. Walsh, Dr. Rutherford, Mr. Byles, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Nicholls, Mr. Mackarness, Major Seely, Mr. A. Taylor, Mr. Lupton, Mr. J. R. Macdonald; *As.* Mr. Churchill, *May 6,* 1335–1344.
Correspondence Presented, *May 6,* 1202, 1302.

[*cont.*

Transvaal—*cont.*
- Registration Bill, Provisions of and Proposals as to.
  - *Q.* Dr. Rutherford; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 2*, 1058, 1059.

Treasury
- *First Lord*—Rt. Hon. Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman.
- *Financial Secretary*—Mr. W. Runciman.
- Secretary, Salary of—Date of taking Vote.
  - *Q.* Mr. Delany; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 25*, 289.

Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [Yorks, W.R., Elland]
- London Municipal Society—London and North-Western Railway, Subscription to, *Apr. 25*, 354, 355.
- London and North-Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 354.
- "Mikado," Cause for Withdrawal of Licence from and Prohibition of Performance by Naval and Marine Bands, *May 6*, 1323, 1346.
- Railway Subscriptions to Party Organisations.
  - Prohibition of—Legislative Proposals, *Apr. 25*, 355.
  - Schedules of Accounts to give Details of, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 355.

Trinidad
- Couva Riots, Information as to.
  - *Q.* Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 30*, 688, 689.
- mport Duty on Swedish Matches, Effect of Reduction in.
  - *Q.* Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 30*, 688.

Turkey
- Customs Duties—Position of Negotiations.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 263.
  - *Q.* Mr. Lonsdale; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 29*, 530.
  - Opportunity for Parliamentary Discussion.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Ashley; *As.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 30*, 693.
  - Papers, Proposals for Laying.
    - *Q.* Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *May 1*, 867.
- Salonica—Circumstances of Capture of Mr. Abbott by Brigands.
  - *Qs.* Major Austruther-Grey, Mr. Fell; *As.* Sir E. Grey, Mr. Speaker, *May 2*, 1061, 1062.
  - Ransom, Proposals for requiring Repayment of, by Turkish Government.
    - *Qs.* Mr. Byles; *As.* Mr. Runciman, *May 6*, 1344, 1345.
- Uskub—Information as to Attack on Mr. Heathcote Smith by Albanians.
  - *Q.* Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *May 6*, 1345.

Turnour, Viscount [Sussex, Horsham]
- Cartridges, Illegal Storage of, in Certain Towns, *May 6*, 1350.
- Colonial Conference, 1907.
  - Preference Resolutions—Publication and Tabling of Speeches, *May 6*, 1358, 1359.
  - Proceedings, Decision as to Publication of, *Apr. 29*, 546.
- Crannagh Farm—Alleged Threatening Letter received from Clooney Sacred Society, *May 1*, 879.
- Empire Day, Official Recognition of, proposed, *Apr. 25*, 288.
- House of Lords—Date of taking Resolution as to, *May 2*, 1085.
- "Mikado," Reason for Admiralty Prohibition of Performance by Bands, *May 6*, 1324.
- Roman Catholic University for Irelands Legislative Proposals for—Protests received from Universities and Colleges, *Apr. 25*, 283.
- Questions asked concerning Ireland—Imputation contained in Speech of Chief Secretary at Halifax, *Apr. 29*, 544, 545; *May 1*, 896, 897.
- St. Lucia Riots—Measures taken to Restore Order, *Apr. 29*, 529.
- Shop Hours Bill, 1904, Attitude of Sir F. Banbury towards, *May 1*, 976, 977, 992.
- Towns and Cities, Development of—Granting Powers to Local Authorities to lay out Suburbs on Rational Lines, *May 1*, 986.
- Transvaal Chinese Labourers, Repatriations effected and Expenditure thereon, *May 6*, 1334.
- Worthing Gas Bill, *Con.*, *Apr. 29*, 603–606, 607, 608, 612.

Tweedmouth, Lord—*First Lord of the Admiralty*
- Casualties to Vessels—Returns as to, *May 1*, 829.
- Dissemination of News in Time of War, Government Control over, etc., *Apr. 29*, 480–482.
- Docking Accommodation for Large Vessels of "Dreadnought" Type, etc., *May 1*, 834–836.
- Home Fleet
  - Ammunition to be Issued to, Information as to, *May 1*, 834.
  - Commander-in-Chief of Channel Fleet, Control over, *May 1*, 834.
  - Constitution of, Manning and Efficiency of Squadrons at the Nore, etc., *May 1*, 831–833.
  - Destroyers, Bases for, *May 1*, 831, 836, 837.

Tweedmouth, Lord—*cont.*
  House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2R., *May 6*, 1268–1272.
  Nucleus Crews, Working of System, *May 1*, 839.
  Pilotage and Navigation, Extension of Courses for Junior Officers, proposed, *May 1*, 829, 830.
  Rosyth, Policy as to, *May 1*, 835.

Tynemouth
  Poor Law Guardians, Co-option of Member by.
    Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Burns, *May 2*, 1065.

Uganda
  Game Preservation, Measures taken for.
    Q. Sir C. Hill; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *May 2*, 1039.

Ulster
  Decrease in Population since 1841.
    Q. Mr. J. MacVeagh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 26*, 382.
  Magistrates, Number and Religion of.
    Q. Mr. J. Devlin; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 6*, 1312.

United Methodist Church Bill
  l. Rep. Apr. 30*, 629.

United States
  Companies Registered during 1906.
    Q. Mr. Vivian; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 265.
  New York Peace Congress, Information as to.
    Q. Mr. Rees; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 24*, 69.
  Pensions paid by Government, Amount of.
    Q. Mr. H. Cox; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 25*, 236.

Universities
  Finances, Emoluments and Government, Inquiry into, proposed.
    Q. Mr. M. Macdonald; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1357, 1358.

Upperlands
  Outrage at House of Mr. W. Tomb—Prosecution of Arrested Persons, etc.
    Q. Mr. Mr. Gordon; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *May 1*, 855.

Ure, Mr. A.—*Solicitor-General for Scotland* [Linlithgow]
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 560–571, 576.

Vaccination
  Order, Cause for Delay in Issue of.
    Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 29*, 507.
  Prosecution, Case of G. Reeves.
    Qs. Mr. Lupton; *As.* Mr. Gladstone, *Apr. 30*, 696, 697.

Vaccination Bill
  c. 1R.* *Apr. 30*, 715.
  Date of Presenting.
    Q. Mr. Lupton; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 30*, 699.

Vagrancy
  Proposals for dealing with.
    Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *May 6*, 1357.

Valuation Bills
  Provisions of.
    Q. Mr. Wedgwood; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 24*, 70.

Venezuela
  Trade Report Presented, *May 2*, 995.

Verney, Mr. F. W. [Bucks, N.]
  Army Expenditure, Increase in, *May 6*, 1327.
  London Municipal Society, Subscription to by London and North-Western Railway, *Apr. 25*, 370.
  London and North-Western Railway Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25*, 370.

Vincent, Colonel Sir C. E. H. [Sheffield, Central]
  Army
    Colonial Militia and Volunteers, Information as to, in Army List, *Apr. 24*, 17.
    Second Line—Camp Pay and Allowance, *Apr. 30*, 684.
  Business of the House, Course of, *Apr. 30*, 714.
  Colonies, British Capital Invested in, and Proposals for Advancing Development of, *May 2*, 1078, 1079.
  Income-tax—Police Pensions, Liability of, *May 2*, 1068, 1069.
  London Streets, Proposals for Regulating Tearing-up of, *Apr. 24*, 70.
  Merchant Shipping Conference—Measures for Counteracting German Attempts to Capture Colonial Carrying Trade with New York, *Apr. 30*, 698.
  Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Financial Resolution, Exemption of, from Closure, proposed, *May 6*, 1441.
  War Office Military Staff, Information as to, *Apr. 30*, 670, 686.
  White Slave Traffic—Proposals for Tabling Papers of International Congress, *Apr. 29*, 504.

Vivian, Mr. H. [Birkenhead]
  United States—Companies Registered during 1906, *Apr. 25*, 265.

Vivisection
Commission Report, Date of Presenting.
Q. Sir P. Magnus; *A.* Mr. Gladstone, *May 1,* 868.
Report (Second) of Royal Commission, Presented, *Apr. 29,* 463, 488.

Volunteers
Annual Return Presented, *Apr. 29,* 463, 489.
Crossan, Gunner, Case of—Claim for Compensation.
Q. Major Anstruther-Gray; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29,* 522.

Walrond, Mr. L. [Devon, Tiverton]
Motors, Legislative Proposals for Dealing with, *May 6,* 1308.
New Hebrides Anglo-French Committee, Date of Meeting, *May 6,* 1307.

Walsh, Mr. S. [Lancashire, S.W. Ince]
Transvaal Chinese Labour—Circumstances of Landing of Unlicensed Coolies, *May 2,* 1056, 1057, 1084; *May 6,* 1336.

Walton, Sir J. L.—*Attorney-General* [Leeds, S.]
Money-Lenders Act, 1900, Proposals for Amending, *May 6,* 1302.
Suicides and others, Letters written by, making Charges against Persons—Desirability of Preventing Publication, *Apr. 25,* 282.

Wandesforde Estate
Sale Proposals for.
Q. Mr. Meagher; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30,* 710, 711.

War Office
Secretary of State—Rt. Hon. R. B. Haldane.
Parliamentary Under-Secretary—Earl of Portsmouth.
Financial Secretary—Mr. T. R. Buchanan.
Messengers Appointed in 1906–7.
Q. Sir S. Scott; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 30,* 681.
Military Staff, Information as to.
Qs. Sir H. Vincent; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 30,* 670, 671, 686.

Ward, Mr. J. [Stoke-on-Trent]
Africa, East—Charge Against Captain Grogan, *May 6,* 1334.
British Museum Reading Room, Redecoration of—Method of Calling for Tenders, *Apr. 25,* 281.
Navy
Portsmouth Dockyards, Rate of Pay at—Payment of Trade Union Rates, proposed, *Apr. 25,* 334, 335, 336.
Rosyth, Policy as to, *Apr. 25,* 335.
Portsmouth, Earl of—Allegations as to Harsh Treatment of Tenant, *Apr. 29,* 538.

Ward, Mr. J.—*cont.*
Transvaal Chinese Labour—Unlicensed Coolies, Circumstances of Admitting and Proposals for Repatriation of, *May 6,* 1335, 1342, 1343.
Woolwich Arsenal Discharges—Proposals for Working on Short Time, *Apr. 29,* 526.

Warde, Colonel C. E. [Kent, Medway]
Motor Commission Recommendations, Action proposed to be taken on, *Apr. 29,* 497.

Wareham
Post Office—Case of Mr. Best.
Q. Colonel R. Williams; *A.* Mr. Buxton, *May 6,* 1350.

Waring, Captain W. [Banffshire]
Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29,* 590–594.

Wason, Mr. J. C. [Orkney and Shetland]
Lerwick Telegraph Staff, Allowance to for Knowledge of Danish proposed, *May 6,* 1351.
Lord Advocate *v.* Colonel Balfour—Government Acquiescence in Decision, *May 6,* 1308.
Scottish Church Property Dispute—Allocation of Churches by Commission, *May 2,* 1071.
Seaweed, Right of Certain Landlords to Claim as Private Property, *May 6,* 1353, 1354.

Waterville
Industrial Class Room, Acquisition of Site for.
Q. Mr. Boland; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24,* 48.

Watford and Edgware Railway Bill
c. Rep. Apr. 24,* 4.

Watt, Mr. H. A. [Glasgow College]
Cavalry—Proposals for Allocating to Scotland, *May 6,* 1329.
Compulsory Weighing and Measurements Bill, 2R., *May 3,* 1184, 1185.
Court of Session Extractor's Department, Application of Sessions Clerks Acts to, *Apr. 29,* 541.
Dairies, Inspection of, in Scotland, *Apr. 30,* 708.
Forth, Firth of—Damage to Fish Caused by Method of Discharging Dredgings, *Apr. 29,* 540.
Hamilton Barracks, Seams of Coal under—Reason for not Continuing Operations in Extracting, *Apr. 29,* 525.
Law Courts—Reduction in time for Appeals from Court of Session to House of Lords, proposed, *Apr. 24,* 42.

[*cont.*

Watt, Mr. H. A.—*cont.*
  Navy
    Obsolete Vessels in Holy Loch and Kyles of Bute, Sale of, *May 2*, 1051.
    Rosyth, price paid for and Date of Commencement of Definite proposals for Utilising as Naval base, *May 2*, 1052.
  Political Pensions, Declaration Required of Applicants for, *May 6*, 1362.
  Railway Rates on Conveyance of Fruit and Vegetables, *Apr. 30*, 697.

Ways and Means
  Proceedings on Report—Suspension of Eleven o'Clock Rule.
    Motion [Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman], *May 1*, 900.

Wedgwood, Mr. J. C. [Newcastle-under Lyme]
  Colonies, British Capital Invested in and Proposals for Advancing Development of, *May 2*, 1079.
  Ecclesiastical Disorder, Failure of Episcopal Authorities to deal with, *Apr. 29*, 497.
  Education (Administrative Provision) Bill —Expert Opinion on which Clause 10 was Drafted, *May 6*, 1310.
  Hammersmith — Ecclesiastical Commissioner's Property Leased for Exhibition Purposes—Provision as to Liquor Licence, *Apr. 24*, 41.
  Juvenile Offenders—Convictions (October to December, 1906) in Certain Cities, *Apr. 25*, 236.
  Valuation Bills, Provision of, *Apr. 24*, 70.

Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
  Beauly and Ness Rivers, Fishery Rights Claimed in, *May 6*, 1351.
  Great Northern and City Railway Bill, *Con.*, *May 6*, 1426.
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 29*, 616–624.

Wellington College
  Report Presented, *Apr. 29*, 463, 488.

Welsh Church
  Commission—Proposals for Filling Vacancies.
    Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 24*, 71, 72.

Wemyss, Earl of
  Army, Second Line or Territorial Force, Age for Recruitment, etc., *Apr. 29*, 482.
    Continental Troops, Possibility of meeting, Amount of Drill Required, etc., *Apr. 29*, 482, 483.
    Drill, Minimum Annual Requirements, *Apr. 29*, 482.
    Mobilisation, Provisions for, *Apr. 29*, 482, 484.

West Indies
  (*See also names of Islands.*)
  Sugar Production and Export (1900–1905), Return Ordered, *May 1*, 843.

West Riding Tramways Bill
  c. 3R.* *Apr. 25*, 228.

West Yorkshire Tramways Bill
  c. Rep. *Apr. 25*, 228.

Western Valleys [Monmouthshire] Sewerage Board Bill
  l. Rep. *Apr. 30*, 629.
  3R.* *May 6*, 1201.

Westmeath
  Death Duty Grant, Amount deducted from.
    Q. Sir W. Nugent; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 24*, 68.

Weston-super-Mare Grand Pier Bill
  c. 2R.* *Apr. 29*, 488.

Wexford
  Grant, Deductions from.
    Q. Mr. M'Hugh; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30*, 665, 666, 706, 707.
    Q. Sir T. Esmonde; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 30*, 679.
  Land Purchase—Expediting Proceedings, proposed.
    Q. Mr. Ffrench; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 24*, 51.

Whitburn Beach
  Colliery Refuse, Date of discontinuing Tipping of.
    Q. Mr. Summerbell; *A.* Mr. Runciman, *Apr. 30*, 705.

White, Mr. J. D. [Dumbartonshire]
  Export and Import Trade with Colonies and India during 1906, *Apr. 30*, 674.
  Shop Hours Act, Failure of—Necessity of more Drastic Legislation with regard to Closing of Shops and Hours of Shop Assistants, *May 1*, 977.
  Small Landholders (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 30*, 794–798.

White, Mr. P. [Neath, N.]
  De Montalt Estate Untenanted Lands, Purchase and Disposal of, *May 6*, 1323.
  Dublin Metropolitan Police
    Criminal Charges manufactured by, *May 2*, 1091–1093.
    Numerical Strength of in excess of Requirements, *May 2*, 1090, 1091, 1094.
    Rates Levied for Upkeep of, Exorbitant Nature of, *May 2*, 1088–1090.

White Slave Traffic
International Conference (1906)
Correspondence Presented, *May 3*, 1166, *May 6*, 1202.
Proposals for Tabling Papers.
Q. Sir H. Vincent; *A.* Sir E. Grey, *Apr. 29*, 504.

Whitehead, Mr. R. [Essex, S.E]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill—Proposals for altering System of Appointing Lords-Lieutenant, *May 6*, 1356.

Wiles, Mr. T. [Islington, S.]
Income-tax Payment by Small Shareholders who are also Employees, Scale of, *Apr. 30*, 705.
Worthing Gas Bill, *Con.*, *Apr. 29*, 606–608.

Williams, Colonel R. [Dorsetshire, W.]
Wareham Post Office—Case of Mr. Best, *May 6*, 1350.

Willoughby de Broke, Lord
House of Lords (Reform) Bill, 2., *May 6*, 1250–1254.

Wilson Mr. A. S. [Yorkshire, E.R., Holderness]
Army General Staff—Cost entailed by Resolution of Colonial Conference, *Apr. 30*, 685.
Hire Purchase Agreements, Stamp Duty on, *May 1*, 946.
Kilnsea and Easington, Proposals for reconstruction of Seabank, *Apr. 30*, 697.
Moray Firth, Trawling in
Foreign Trawlers Observed and Examined, *Apr. 30*, 708.

Wilson, Mr. J. W. [Worcestershire, N.]
Juvenile Offenders, Special Courts held for, *May 6*, 1316.

Wilson, Mr. P. W. [St. Pancras, S.]
Towns and Cities.
Development of—Granting Powers to Local Authorities to lay out Suburbs on Rational Lines, *May 1*, 978–982.
Garden Cities, Results of Experiments with, *May, 1*, 980, 981.

Women
Local Bodies, Proposals for Legislation to empower Service on.
Q. Sir W. J. Collins; *A.* Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, *Apr. 24*, *29*.

Woolwich Arsenal
Adult Employees earning less than 30s. per Week.
Q. Mr. T. F. Richards; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 30*, 685.

Woolwich Arsenal—*cont.*
Allocation of Army and Navy Work to, in order to prevent Discharges.
Qs. Mr. Bellairs; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *May 6*, 1330.
Discharges
Employment in this Country, Prospects of—Proposals for Pecuniary Aid, etc.
Q. Mr. Atherley-Jones; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29*, 502–503.
Germany, Offers of Employment in.
Qs. Mr. Fell; *As.* Mr. Kearley, *May 2*, 1064, 1065.
Short Time, Proposals for Working on, and Number of Discharges Projected.
Qs. Mr. P. Pease, Mr. Crooks, Major Anstruther-Gray, Mr. J. Ward, Mr. Hunt; *As.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 29*, 525–527.
Q. Mr. C. Hay; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *May 1*, 865.

Workmen's Compensation Act
Parish Council Clerk and Overseer, Legality of Charge for Insuring.
Q. Mr. Hunt; *A.* Mr. Burns, *Apr. 29*, 533, 534.

Works Board, Ireland
See under Ireland.

Worthing Gas Bill
c. *Con.** *Apr. 29*, 599.
3R.* *May 2*, 1033.
l. 1R.* *May 2*, 994.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G. [Dover]
Territorial and Reserve Forces Bill
Allocation of Time to Various Stages, Proposals as to, *May 6*, 1385–1390.
Clauses 5–40, Allowing Extra Day for Discussion of, proposed, *May 6*. 1451–1453.
Militia, Regulations as to Enlistment in Special Reserve, *May 6*, 1387. 1392.
War Taxes, Reasons for continuing as a Permanent Charge, *May 1*, 938.

Wynne Estate
Sweeney, P., Case of.
Q. Mr. Dolan; *A.* Mr. Birrell, *Apr. 26*, 384.

Yeomanry

King's Colonial Imperial Yeomanry, Permission for furnishing Guard of Honour by, at Banquet to Colonial Premiers.
Q. Dr. Hazel; *A.* Mr. Haldane, *Apr. 24,* 18.

Young, Mr. S. [Cavan, E.]

ailieborough

Evicted Tenants, Reinstatement Claims of, *Apr. 29,* 513.

Rural District Council Architect—Appointment of Mr. T. Daniel, *Apr. 29,* 512.

Dernakesh Postal Facilities, Improvement of, proposed, *Apr. 25,* 244.

Kingscourt Post Office Extension, Building of, *Apr. 26,* 376.

Younger, Mr. G. [Ayr Burghs]

Liquor Traffic (Local Option) (Scotland) Bill, 2R., *Apr. 25,* 439–443.

Parish Electors in Scotland, Information as to, *Apr. 25,* 283.

Rosyth

Policy as to, *Apr. 25,* 335.

Youthful Offenders

See Juvenile Offenders.

Zanzibar

Slavery in Coast Strip, Abolition of—Contents of Despatch of January.
Q. Sir C. Dilke; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 24,* 23.
Q. Mr. P. Pease; *A.* Mr. Churchill, *Apr. 24,* 31.
